Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-062
Monday
1 April 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-062 *1 April 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

General Staff Aide Details Armed Forces Cuts *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Mar]* 1
Karpov Reviews Arms Talks, European Security *[Moscow Radio]* 1
Bogachev Views Cheney Speech, Arms Control *[TASS]* 3

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Army Chief of Staff Lobov on Warsaw Pact 5
Details Member-States' Budgets *[IZVESTIYA 29 Mar]* 5
Assesses NATO Strength *[Moscow International]* 5

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

European Security After Pact Viewed *[TASS]* 7
Frolov Addresses East Europe Press Chiefs *[PRAVDA 22 Mar]* 7
East-West Economic Ties Discussed *[IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]* 8

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Plans for Gulf Presence Examined *[Moscow International]* 9
U.S. Faces Conflict Over Arms Sales to Allies *[PRAVDA 26 Mar]* 9

China

Jiang Zemin Sees 'New Stage' in Relations *[TASS]* 10
1991 Trade Protocol Signed With China *[Moscow TV]* 10
PRC Foreign Minister Holds News Conference *[IZVESTIYA 29 Mar]* 11

Northeast Asia

Reportage on Bessmertnykh's Visit to Japan 12
Met by Legislators 29 Mar *[Moscow TV]* 12
Makes Arrival Statement *[TASS]* 12
Meets Japanese Counterpart *[TASS]* 12
Sees Hiroshima Official *[TASS]* 13
Meets Japanese Premier 30 Mar *[TASS]* 13
Holds News Conference *[TASS]* 13
Meets Counterpart on Peace Treaty *[TASS]* 14
Talks End *[TASS]* 14
Begins Brief Country Tour *[TASS]* 14
Visit Results Summarized *[Moscow International]* 14
Japanese Coverage Noted *[cross-reference]* 15
Differences Continue With Japan Over Territories 15
Visits Address Debate *[PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 15
Solution to 'Impasse' Suggested *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 12]* 16

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Thai-Vietnamese Ties, Cambodia Settlement Viewed *[Moscow International]* 17
Southeast Asian Territorial Disputes Viewed *[Moscow International]* 17

East Europe

Outcome of Albanian Elections Pondered *[PRAVDA 1 Apr]* 17

Latin America & Caribbean

Diplomatic Relations Established With Panama *[PRAVDA 30 Mar]* 18
Cubans Sense Danger From U.S. Gulf Victory *[Moscow International]* 19

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

29 March Session Proceedings Detailed *[Moscow TV]* 20
Pugo Address *[Moscow TV]* 20

Supreme Soviet

Deputies Discuss Rally, Draft Enterprise Law *[IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]* 23
International Committee on Ties With Japan *[IZVESTIYA 29 Mar]* 23
Supreme Soviet Discussion on Demonstration *[PRAVDA 29 Mar]* 23
Further Debate on Moscow Rally Ban *[IZVESTIYA 29 Mar]* 24
Heated Debate at 28 Mar Session *[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* 25

Political & Social

Yazov Answers Viewers' Questions *[Moscow TV]* 26
Shevardnadze on Perestroyka's Chances *[Hamburg DPA]* 41
Pugo Interviewed on 28 Mar Demonstration *[TASS]* 41
MVD, KGB Report on Demonstration *[TASS]* 42
Politburo Assesses Referendum Results *[PRAVDA 1 Apr]* 42
Politburo's Luchinskiy Holds News Conference *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 44
Shenin Chairs Party Cadre Session *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 27 Mar]* 45
PRAVDA Account of Gorbachev TV Interview *[29 Mar]* 45
Counterintelligence Chief on Security Threat *[Moscow International]* 52
Liberal Democratic Party Leader on Platform *[TASS]* 52
TV Program Views Internal Problems, U.S. Ties *[Moscow TV]* 52

Economic

Gorbachev Sends Letter to Republics on Pricing *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Gorbachev Letter Viewed *[TASS]* 53
State Bank Introduces Foreign Currency Rules *[TASS]* 53
Economist Calls for 'Harsh' Economic Measures *[TASS]* 54
Kuzbass Mine Strikes, Talks With Leaders Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Kuzbass Situation Updated *[Moscow Radio]* 55
Radios Report Conflicting Data *[Moscow Radio]* 55

Military

Reports Follow 29 Mar All-Army Party Conference 55
'Bewilderment' Seen Over Role *[Moscow TV]* 55
Shlyaga, Yazov Address Talks *[TASS]* 56
Officials Elected *[TASS]* 56
Gorbachev Gives Speech *[Moscow Radio]* 56
Conference Ends *[Moscow Radio]* 57

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Baltic Military District Party Conference Held *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Mar]* 58
Estonia, Moldova Sign Cooperation Agreement *[TASS]* 58
Bush Receives Estonian President in Washington *[TASS]* 58
Lithuanian Talks With USSR To Resume 4 April *[TASS]* 58
MVD Official Sends Message to Lithuanian Premier *[Vilnius International]* 58
Lithuania To Increase Oil Production *[Radio Vilnius]* 59
Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party Theses *[EKHO LITVY 16 Mar]* 59
Lithuanian Nuclear Project's Future Discussed *[EKHO LITVY 16 Mar]* 60
Landsbergis on Soviet Envoy's FRG Speech *[EKHO LITVY 16 Mar]* 60

RSFSR

Further Reportage on Moscow Demonstrations *[Moscow TV]* 61
PRAVDA on Security Situation *[29 Mar]* 61
People's Deputy on OMON Suppression *[Radio Rossii]* 62
Pro-Yeltsin Rally in Leningrad Reported *[Radio Rossii]* 62
Silayev Urges Better Conditions for Enterprises *[TASS]* 62
Miners' Representatives Not Invited to Talks *[Radio Rossii]* 63
TASS Updates Situation in Coalfields 63
Official Alleges Plan To Shoot Down Satellite *[Moscow TV]* 63
PRAVDA on 28 Mar RSFSR Congress Session *[29 Mar]* 63

RSFSR Congress 29 Mar

Session Resumes After Break To Decide Agenda *[Moscow Radio]* 65
TASS Sums Up Debate Over Agenda 66
Vote on Agenda Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 66
Yeltsin Requests More Than Hour To Speak *[Radio Rossii]* 67
Yeltsin Address on Conditions in Republic *[Radio Rossii]* 67
TASS Reports Highlights of Yeltsin Address 79
Moscow TV Program Details 29 March Session 80

RSFSR Congress 30 Mar

Moscow TV Continues Coverage of 30 Mar Session 81
Deputies To Discuss Yeltsin Report on Reforms *[TASS]* 83
Yeltsin Answers Questions From Deputies *[TASS]* 84
Radio Rossii Reports Answers 84
Moscow TV Carries Answers 85
Miners' Telegram Criticizes RSFSR Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 88
Deputies Called on To Decide Presidency Issue *[TASS]* 89
Isakov on Yeltsin; Suggests Gorbachev Step Down *[TASS]* 89
Radio Reports Isakov Criticism *[Radio Rossii]* 90
Zakharov on Reduced Russian Military Contributions *[Radio Rossii]* 93
Yeltsin, Khasbulatov Interview Cited *[Radio Rossii]* 93
Moscow TV Sees 'Maneuvering' During Debates 94
Goryacheva Address on 'Political Statement' *[Moscow TV]* 94
Radio Highlights Yeltsin Criticism *[Moscow Radio]* 96
Prime Minister Silayev Presents Economic Program *[Moscow TV]* 97
TASS Highlights Address 100
Shakray Says Yeltsin Ouster Unrealistic *[TASS]* 100

Western Republics

Ukraine Miners' Strike 'Remains Critical' *[Kiev International]* 101
Kravchuk Discusses Union Treaty, Gorbachev *[Kiev International]* 101

Caucasus

Reportage on Georgian 31 Mar Poll, Referendum 101
Communists Demand Equal Rights *[Tbilisi VESTNIK GRUZII 22 Mar]* 101
Elections, Independence Vote Begin *[Moscow Radio]* 102
Referendum, Elections Viewed *[TASS]* 102
80 Percent Vote in Referendum *[Moscow International]* 103
INTERFAX Cited on Vote *[AFP]* 103
Tbilisi Airport Closed for 'Technical Reasons' *[Moscow Radio]* 103
Gorbachev Cables Gamsakhurdia To Stop Bloodshed *[TASS]* 103
South Ossetians Appeal to Leadership for Help *[Moscow Radio]* 103
South Ossetians Flee 'Burned, Pillaged' Homes *[Moscow TV]* 104
Situation in South Ossetia 'Remains Serious' *[TASS]* 104
Tskhinvali Residents Call for State of Emergency *[Moscow TV]* 104

General Staff Aide Details Armed Forces Cuts

PM2903160991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Lieutenant General F.I. Ladygin, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Treaty and Legal Directorate, by TASS correspondent; place and date not given: "From Plans to Practical Actions"]

[Text] The U.S. military leadership plans to cut its national armed forces. A TASS correspondent asked Lt. Gen. F.I. Ladygin, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Treaty and Legal Directorate, to comment on this Pentagon decision and compare it with the Soviet Army cuts:

[Ladygin] Citing U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney, NEWSWEEK reported that the plan is to cut the number of U.S. Navy warships from 545 to 435 and the Marine Corps from 196,000 to 160,000 men by 1997. Provision is made for cutting the number of ground divisions by 10 by 1995. Soviet military circles regard these as positive intentions on the part of the U.S. side.

Back in 1978 at the UN General Assembly first special session on disarmament the Soviet Union said that there was a possibility of implementing cuts in armed forces and conventional arms. The unilateral withdrawal from the GDR of 20,000 Soviet servicemen, 1,000 tanks, and other military hardware was an example of the USSR's serious approach in this sphere.

In line with the decisions adopted in 1988 on unilateral cuts in the USSR Armed Forces, the numerical strength of the Army and Navy is to drop by 500,000. Some 10,000 tanks, 8,500 artillery systems, and 820 combat aircraft are to be cut in the European part of the country and the groups of forces.

In the process of tailoring the USSR Armed Forces to suit the demands of contemporary military doctrine and imparting a greater defensive thrust to their organizational structure there are to be cuts in the quantity of arms and hardware of 10,500 tanks, 19,900 artillery systems, and 1,000 combat aircraft.

To date, since the unilateral Armed Forces cuts began, we have disbanded the directorates of two military districts, four combined-arms armies, five army corps, one missile formation, five missile units, and four air defense divisions. Some 38 tank and motorized rifle divisions, 27 missile regiments, two military district aviation formations, two aviation divisions, six antiaircraft missile brigades, and a number of other formations and units have been cut back.

As a result, as compared with 1988, the numerical strength of the USSR Armed Forces has dropped by more than 450,000 servicemen. In the European part of the USSR and groups of forces the number of tanks, combat armored vehicles, artillery systems, and combat aircraft have been reduced by 20,500, 19,300, 28,400, and 1,950 respectively; while 26 submarines and 45 surface ships and launches have been decommissioned and scrapped.

As is well known, the military organization of the Warsaw Treaty is to be abolished by 31 March 1991. The Soviet Union will complete the withdrawal of its troops from the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and Hungary by 1 July 1991. The troop withdrawal from FRG territory is continuing. We are beginning to withdraw troops from Poland.

Thus, further cuts in the Soviet Armed Forces, their numerical strength, and basic arms systems are envisaged within the framework of the military reform now under way, but, of course, without detriment to the country's defense capability and with consideration for the development of the world military-political and military-strategic situation.

Karpov Reviews Arms Talks, European Security

LD3003190791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1215 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Interview with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Pavlovich Karpov by correspondent Vladimir Pasko; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Pasko] Hello, comrades. Now that peace has returned triumphantly to the Persian Gulf region, attention is again returning to topical matters. It has been four months since the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries signed a treaty in Paris on conventional armed forces in Europe. After decades of confrontation, the two largest military and political organizations at long last stated that they would strive to replace military confrontation with relations of a new nature: security on the basis of peaceful cooperation. By way of confirming this, the sides pledged to retain only such military potential as is essential to prevent war and to ensure effective defense.

As the first step toward this goal, the two sides agreed on substantial cuts, down to definite levels, of five categories of offensive arms. But it now transpires that obstacles have emerged on the path to the treaty coming into force. The parliaments of Western countries refuse to ratify it. If the press is anything to go by, the reason for this consists of three aspects: confusion with numerical data, our transfer of several thousands tanks from Europe to the other side of the Urals in 1989, and the transfer of three Soviet ground forces divisions to the Navy's administration. The first two concerns appear to have been removed, but things turned out to be more complicated as far as the third aspect is concerned. This, then, is the reason behind our meeting with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Karpov.

Viktor Pavlovich, what has happened, and what is the way out of the situation that has taken shape?

[Karpov] The questions now surfacing have their source in the old dispute regarding the scope of the talks. Right

from the very beginning the Soviet Union came out in favor of including Navy, ground forces, and Air Force arms alike in the total balance of arms under discussion at the Vienna talks and their subsequent inclusion among the arms to be cut per the treaty. Unfortunately, the NATO countries rejected this position. As a result, the scope of the talks, approved in January 1989, included the proviso that Naval arms are not included in the subject matter of the current talks. But, even before that, the Soviet Union, implementing its new doctrine, military doctrine, began to restructure its military foces along defensive principles. And in connection with this, three motor rifle divisions were transferred to coast guard duties—that is to say, to the Navy establishment.

On 18 November last year, on the eve of the signing of the treaty, the USSR presented data about its Armed Forces, about the Coast Guard, the Marines, separately from those armaments which, according to the treaty, were subject to being registered. It must be said that at that time we were not asked about this. But now, the NATO countries are raising the question of these armaments and are complaining that we, allegedly, want to keep armaments of the Coast Guard and the Marines above the levels which we are supposed to have, in accordance with the treaty. This refers, primarily, to those categories of armaments as tanks, armored combat vehicles, and artillery pieces. Therefore, it is a question of the interpration of Article 3 of the treaty, which is concerned with the composition of the armaments subject to limitation.

We think that the sides discussed this question for quite long enough, at this theoretical level, as it were, but did not arrive at a common opinion. The mandate of the talks was a compromise. Therefore, now, we think that to continue such an argument with regard to the interpretation of the treaty is hardly likely to create the opportunity to find a mutually acceptable decision. Therefore, during our contacts, including the recent ones with Secretary of State Baker, with German Vice Chancellor Genscher, with British Foreign Secretary Hurd, these questions were discussed. The Soviet Union proposes to seek the resolution of questions which arise along practical paths.

We are prepared to accept that the levels which are allocated to the Soviet Union under the treaty—that is, 13,150 tanks, 13,175 artillery pieces and 20,000 (?armored vehicles), that these levels should not be exceeded on account of these three divisions of the coastal defense. We are ready to discuss such a solution. We are prepared to seek a mutually acceptable formula here. Now, it is up to our Western partners, so I think that such a practical approach, of calm diplomacy, of a calm search for mutually acceptable solutions, will probably be likely to produce results.

[Pasko] Viktor Pavlovich, a hidden question that arises is whether or not opponents of the treaty are making their existence felt in this connection.

[Karpov] I would not begin witch hunting in this regard. The treaty in itself is of very great significance for the further construction of the common European home and the creation of new European security structures. For this reason, attitudes toward it throughout all of Europe are uniformly positive. There are, of course, people who are opposed in principle to new approaches toward the creation of a European security system. There are people who think that reliance on military force guarantees security. However, I think that there are fewer and fewer people ready to uphold that position. There is, therefore, a search for new structures of security, security that encompasses all of Europe, the entire European continent, and envisages a transition from confrontation based on military blocs to cooperation between all European states, including the reduction in the numbers of the Armed Forces in the European continent and the reduction of their offensive potential, and a transition to a defensive footing, and so on. This is starting through the Paris Treaty and by the confidence-building measures agreed to and approved in Paris.

This course is receiving more and more support. If tendencies running counter to this are appearing in various European countries, they will certainly have no chance of developing. Therefore, I would assess the difficulties that have arisen in the implementation of the treaty as echoes of the differences over what should first and foremost be limited by the treaty, which were also revealed while agreement was being reached on the mandate for the talks—in other words, over whether or not the armaments of the navies should be limited now, at this stage of the talks. We continue to think that the limitation of such forces should become part of a Europe-wide decision on security matters, and we shall actively strive to achieve this.

[Pasko] Now, for a question that is not directly connected, but is indirectly, I think, connected with the first one. Implementation of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles in Europe is to be completed in May. This treaty was a breakthrough in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. All of us can recall with what hopes it was welcomed. One can say that the hopes have been vindicated. The treaty has been followed by the preparation of an agreement on reducing strategic offensive armaments. The text of the treaty is almost ready, and yet something still remains to be done. What is the reason?

[Karpov] Indeed, from the sidelines it may seem somewhat strange that both powers, both the United States and the Soviet Union, say that the treaty on strategic offensive arms limitation is virtually ready, that a few technical issues need to be resolved, and it can be signed. But, at the same time, the treaty is not ready for signing. At the moment, on the initiative of the American side, a break in the talks in Geneva has been announced. What is going on? We can trace a certain tendency, right now, on the American side to tie the resolution on strategic arms with implementation of the treaty on conventional

armed forces in Europe. This is informal; that is, officially there is no such stand, but in fact it can clearly be discerned. We might think that the issues which remain, 12 to 15 issues, are resolvable, that they are of a technical nature, and that the political issues have been resolved. But recently we have come across a position of the U.S. delegation in Geneva which, I would say, could be describe in one word as stalling. Either they do not have their instructions from Washington, or some issue is sent off to Washington for further consideration, or some extra issue arises on the American side that was not raised earlier in this connection, and so on. Finally, it has now become clear that Ambassador Burt, head of the U.S. delegation, is resigning. This is another factor that had to be taken into account, and so on. That is, there you have the situation. In my view, of course, it does not help to conclude the talks quickly, and we agreed with the U.S. side to arrange a break, to look things over, and to embark on completing the elaboration of the treaty again in April. I think that, of course, the elimination of the disagreements existing over the treaty on conventional arms in Europe will, of course, make it possible to speed up these talks on strategic arms, as well.

[Pasko] Viktor Pavlovich, I'd like to ask another question. There is an active search going on in Europe for new security structures. The countries of eastern Europe are looking for their paths, new approaches to the problems of security are being worked out in the West, but at the time when, on 31 March, the military organization of the Warsaw Treaty ceases to exist, the military organization of NATO is not only not being dissolved, but is being modernized.

The presence of our strategic forces guarantees us protection from anything unexpected, but still, how are we to regard this, to regard the fact that the NATO military organization is being maintained, at least up to today?

[Karpov] These questions certainly exist. They are serious questions. We certainly must not brush them aside. It must be said that new tendencies are now becoming visible in the actual NATO organization, and in its military part, tendencies which can also be described as a movement in the direction of reconsidering the most offensive ideas of NATO, ideas connected with the use of nuclear weapons, the conduct of offensive operations. That is to say, a certain reexamination of the actual basic postulates of NATO military doctrine is going on.

Already, the NATO evaluation of what used to be called the Soviet threat has changed. I would say that there is a reevaluation of values, so that not many people now believe that the Soviet Union represents an aggressive state that only sleeps and dreams of how to seize western Europe by means of armed force. No one takes this seriously any more. For that reason, the very structure of NATO, the very aim of the NATO military doctrine, is starting to come under pressure from both political figures and from the public toward reconsidering it.

The seminar taking place on the military doctrine in the framework of the Vienna talks showed that these tendencies are gaining more and more weight. The political cooperation being laid down between us and NATO now that we have appointed our ambassador to Brussels—this contact is now gaining significant weight. We are being given information. We, in turn, inform NATO about our actions. I must say the demands to go more energetically down the road of creating common European security structures are knocking more and more at today's door.

The reduction of armed forces in Europe as a result of the Paris Treaty is the first brick in the foundation of a future common European system. This is the very great significance of the treaty. Now, of course, we need to more actively promote the idea of creating new European structures.

When it is said that certain East European countries are knocking at NATO's door, wanting to enter and increase NATO's military potential, I would not overdramatize these reports. The fact is that, as far as can be judged from the information in our possession, NATO countries are not interested in East European countries becoming part of NATO's military structure. I think that this will not occur within the next few years.

Therefore, the question is how the Soviet Union may, in the new conditions, guarantee its security in view of the withdrawal of our forces from East European countries and in view of the departure of these countries from the military organization of the Warsaw Treaty. In this regard, reserves and possibilities do exist for the conclusion of a system, I would say, of bilateral relations with East European countries that would, well, they would not replace the military form of cooperation, and now probably there should be no question of that, but they would attest to possibilities for ensuring our security in this area with the assistance of these countries that accord with the general interests of both the East European countries, and also the security interests of the Soviet Union. In this respect, our work is far from over and we are still only just getting down to it.

I would say that the fact that NATO will remain a military force in Europe is a reality. But further progress toward the creation of Europe-wide institutions, the economic integration of Europe, its legal integration, the creation of what is called a common law- governed space, and other measures to create the common European home is indeed the path that should bring about a strengthening of security on a new basis.

[Pasko] Many thanks.

Bogachev Views Cheney Speech, Arms Control

LD3003095491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1907 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Report by TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow, 29 Mar (TASS)—The significant changes in the Soviet Union and the positive events in international life that have reduced the threat of a world war should not shake the dedication of the United States "to a strong national defense" and its resolve to take "a leading role" in the world, U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney considers.

Speaking on Thursday to members of the United States Naval League in Washington, the leader of the U.S. military department maintained that the Soviet Union is keeping "a very major army in Europe and is continuing to implement a powerful program for the modernization of its strategic potential." Cheney threw doubt on "the departure from militarism" in the Soviet Union and confirmed the aim he previously expressed about development of the offensive and defensive strategic forces of the United States.

The fact also draws attention to itself that in recent times during discussion of the ideas of "a new world order" put forward by U.S. President George Bush, the stress in Washington has been laid on "the preservation of a first class strategic potential" using revolutionary achievements in the sphere of military technology. The guarantee of stability and security by means of accords on arms control, it seems, is acquiring secondary importance in Washington. This same Cheney, for example, in the House of Representatives in the U.S. Congress last week, very pessimistically appraised the prospects for concluding agreements on strategic and conventional weapons during the near future and laid the blame for the "unsettled differences" on the Soviet side.

Despite the dissolution of the military organization of the Warsaw Pact, the unilateral reduction in the Soviet Armed Forces and the withdrawal of USSR troops from Eastern Europe, Washington continues as before to insist that the Soviet Union eliminate, in accordance with the treaties, far more weapons than the United States. Quite recently demands for such "assymetrical" reductions were justified in the United States by the fact that the Soviet Union possessed supremacy "in accordance with virtually all indicators of military power." American leaders have now rushed to the other extreme and are shouting about "the huge supremacy of the United States over the USSR in the military sphere."

Public appraisals of the balance of forces between the USSR and the United States in Washington are changing, but demands for disproportionately larger reductions in weapons by the Soviet Union remain as before.

Meanwhile, now that the military organization of the Warsaw Pact no longer exists, the USSR must solve the problem of its own security, relying only on national means and resources. Therefore, in particular, the limitation in the number of troops should be carried out on a national basis. It is evidently necessary to set the levels for the numbers of troops for each state participating in the talks.

The resolution of arms control issues by taking into account the new situation in the world is the only fair one. Of course, that is if one does not proceed from a recognition of the right of the United States to military supremacy over all the other countries of the world.

Army Chief of Staff Lobov on Warsaw Pact

Details Member-States' Budgets

PM2803160191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Interview with Army General V. Lobov by correspondent N. Burbyga under "Informed Sources" rubric, place and date not given, first paragraph is editorial introduction: "The Warsaw Pact Has Been Scrapped. What Next?"]

[Text] On 31 March the Joint Armed Forces of the states parties to the Warsaw Pact and their administrative organs cease to function. Army General V. Lobov, chief of staff of the Joint Armed Forces and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for International Affairs, answered our correspondent N. Burbyga's questions.

[Burbyga] Vladimir Nikolayevich, how were the Joint Armed Forces financed and what was their budget?

[Lobov] The budget was around 8 million rubles. Financing was carried out by all the Warsaw Pact member-states. The contribution of each allied country to the overall budget was determined in the following way: Bulgaria—7 percent, Hungary—6 percent, the GDR—6 percent, Poland—13.5 percent, Romania—10 percent, the CSSR—13 percent, and the USSR—44.5 percent. It must be borne in mind that the Joint Armed Forces did not incorporate the allied countries' armies in full but only a certain proportion of them as laid down by the corresponding agreements. In peacetime these troops and forces remained under the jurisdiction of their national commands. Thus the budget was spent solely on the upkeep of management organs and the implementation of joint events.

[Burbyga] It has been stated that after the elimination of the Warsaw Pact's military structures it will be transformed from a military-political alliance into a purely political one. What does this mean?

[Lobov] I think that in its new capacity the Warsaw Pact will continue to make efforts to create a collective security system in Europe and build the "common European home." The continuation of the process of talks on the further reduction of conventional armed forces in Europe is easier to conduct on the old, coalition basis. Otherwise, the East European countries will inevitably encounter attempts to force them into second-class roles. That is why collaboration among the Warsaw Pact states in the political sphere may prove a tangible factor in their struggle for a "place in the sun."

[Burbyga] In your view, how will the security of the East European countries be safeguarded in the future?

[Lobov] Today we are seeing a transition from bloc structures for safeguarding security to a collective, all-European security. And the Warsaw Pact states are seeking to create a collective security system in Europe based on the participation of all the European states plus the United States and Canada. The signing of the Paris agreements last November was a successful beginning of this process.

[Burbyga] What fate awaits the officers and generals who have served in the Joint Armed Forces administrative organs?

[Lobov] The generals, admirals, and officers of the allied armies who have served at Warsaw Pact headquarters are generally highly trained military specialists experienced in military-diplomatic work. I hope that they will continue serving in their countries' armies in responsible posts.

[Burbyga] One last question: To whom will the building where the Warsaw Pact headquarters were housed be transferred?

[Lobov] It was leased from the USSR Ministry of Defense and thus will be transferred back to it.

Assesses NATO Strength

LD0104044491 Moscow International Service in Slovak 1800 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Interview with General Vladimir Lobov, chief of staff of the Warsaw Pact Joint Military Command, by military correspondent Colonel Vadim Solovyev; place and date not given—recorded in Russian fading into Slovak translation]

[Text] [Lobov] What have we already done? First, we have destroyed and annuled all the documents determining the activity of the military forces belonging to the Warsaw Pact. Second, we have recalled representatives of the chief command from the countries of their deployment in the Warsaw Pact member-states. They completed their work, returned to their homelands, and left for new places where they will continue their duty. Third, groups of generals and officers who used to represent their countries on the Warsaw Pact staff—their number varies between 15 and 50—have completely finished their work. The last group will leave on 30 March; on 31 March we will officially end our activity. There was a spirit of comradeship on the staff of the Joint Military Command; it was a highly qualified and highly intellectual group of people [kolektiv]. The staff's generals and officers made dignified contributions to a common cause. Now, they are returning to their countries. In my opinion, the governments of these countries are obliged to provide them with accomodation, jobs, and treat them as citizens who bravely fulfilled the role that had been assigned to them by the people, state, and government.

[Solovyev] How would you assess the activity of the military organization of the Warsaw Pact for the 36 years of its existence?

[Lobov] There is a great number of opinions concerning the [word indistinct] of the military organization of the

Warsaw Pact, one of them being it was allegedly predetermined for suppressing the states that belong to it, that its activity had almost an agressive character. But people are mistaken. It is natural that, like any other organization, the Warsaw Pact had certain shortcomings, both in the sphere of political and military activity. However, when you look back at the 36 years of activity, you will see that the military organization had been acting as a guarantor of peace in Europe—and not only in this part of the world. The most important thing was the confrontation with the North Atlantic Pact [NATO] during the difficult times when the possibility of an outbreak of war was very high. That was not so long ago. The Warsaw Pact military organization was a guarantor of peace. At the same time, in particular during the last phase of the organization's existence, it contributed to the success achieved in the area of easing international tension. We have come to understand that the world must not develop on the basis of confrontation of blocs, but through economic, political, and cultural cooperation. Only this can serve the reliable foundations of security in Europe and in the world.

[Solovyev] Is it possible to conclude from what you say that this means the end of armies, that the liquidation of the Warsaw Pact military organization also means the liquidation of all contacts between the armies that used to form it?

[Lobov] Taking into account the main trends in the world at present, we are unfortunately unable to say that we have put an end to a military threat. A recent example is the Persian Gulf war. That is why each individual state has to guarantee its security, security for its nation. The experiences gathered by the Warsaw Pact belong to each Army that was a member. These experiences are now going to be used not on the basis of the pact but on a bilateral basis. The future belongs to this trend of military relations. Recently, an agreement was concluded between Romania and the Soviet Union, and in my view it is a very significant event. I am aware of the fact that other states are now preparing documents to conclude bilateral relations. I am convinced that this is the way relations between us and our neighbors are going to be built now.

[Solovyev] It is well-known that it was originally envisaged that a transformation of the two military blocs in Europe—the Warsaw Pact and NATO—to purely political organizations would be synchronized. Nevertheless, the situation is that the Warsaw Pact is ahead. Will this not lead to a change in the balance of forces in Europe? Peace is, after all, rather fragile and not so stable as we would wish.

[Lobov] I will give you a sincere answer, regardless of the possibility that I will be blamed. I expected more from the NATO military organization, from its political leadership. We put great hope in last year's highest-level meeting in London. We felt great hope thanks to the assurances that NATO is going to strive to achieve political transformation. Nevertheless, the words voiced there were just words, as no specific steps to meet the Warsaw Pact half way have taken place yet—or at least we are not aware of them. On the other hand, I am seriously alarmed by the fact that under the veil of the Persian Gulf war, NATO influence is in substance being widened. The U.S. defense secretary as well as high Pentagon officials now say openly that they intend to place command bodies of the forward defense as well as 3,000 or possibly more soldiers in the Arabian desert. This means that NATO strengthens its new position. The international public should be alarmed by these processes. The Warsaw Pact military organization becomes a thing of history. The NATO military organization should take the same steps, otherwise it would hardly be possible to say that the military threat in Europe has been eliminated.

European Security After Pact Viewed

LD0104101691 Moscow TASS in English 1007 GMT 1 Apr 91

[By TASS international news analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—The military structure of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation was eliminated as of midnight on March 31. The agreement was concluded by the USSR, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania. The dissolution of the military organisation of the Warsaw Pact directly contributes to achieving the goals set by the Paris Charter for new Europe. This event is viewed as confirmation of the triumph of new political thinking, the continued movement away from the cold war epoch, and an important factor for consolidating positive changes in the international climate.

However, the question remains: Can European security be ensured by relying solely on the western military structure, the North Atlantic alliance?.

NATO headquarters has been the scene of heated debates about the future role of that military-political bloc. The decisions taken must be guided by arrangements reached at the Parisian meeting of leaders of the countries, participants in the conference on security and cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

Various plans have been advanced to heighten NATO's international role. The western press writes that this is a manifestation of euphoria after the disintegration of the Warsaw Treaty and the victory in the Gulf war, which prompted some to rely on power in world politics. However, France, Germany, Spain, Belgium declare resolutely against turning NATO into a "world policeman".

With the elimination of military structure of the Warsaw Treaty East European countries look for a new foreign policy strategy. Some in East European capitals have even cited a need to join NATO.

These statements should be deplored. Even associated membership in NATO of countries sharing borders with the USSR cannot but affect the Soviet defence policy. This would lead to a serious revision of the entire system of European security that is in place.

The elimination of military structures of the Warsaw Treaty should not be an impetus for reinforcing NATO but for determining conditions and measures for ensuring security in Europe outside the framework of military blocs. The security of each state must be viewed as part of European security, as is stated in the joint declaration of 22 states signed by government leaders in Paris last year.

Frolov Addresses East Europe Press Chiefs

PM0104153991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 91 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed account under general headline "Society-Party-Paper" of speech by I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chief editor of PRAVDA, at "recent" Moscow meeting of heads of socialist countries' and East European countries' newspapers, organized by PRAVDA: "Moscow, March"]

[Text] We are gathered here to exchange opinions on current issues. No one has forced this meeting on us. It is dictated by necessity and is taking place in accordance with the conditions and principles of complete equality.

I know that in some countries our friends and our ideological colleagues are even now organizing their publications in an entirely new way. They are operating in very competitive, market conditions, in conditions of a multiparty system and very broad social and ideological pluralism. A fierce political struggle is in progress. We have not always been ready to carry out our work at the proper level in our countries in the new conditions, including this political struggle. Decades of authoritarian, bureaucratic relations and the absence of glasnost have had a significant effect on people's minds and on the forms of work, including ours.

We in PRAVDA are doing all we can to transform the paper step by step. We are doing a great deal of work on a number of ideological and political problems. Above all in the context of the preparation of a draft new party program. We are trying to interpret socialism as a humane, democratic society in which glasnost, the multiparty system, and pluralism of opinions are the dominant factors.

It is not easy; there are many problems. Some of them could be caused, I believe, by the overestimation of stability factors in the development of public consciousness; others are due to an underestimation of that which will be reproduced in every generation, namely that which is the repository of the positive in society and propels us forward. What we call education and development. It is a continuous process. I like Marx's idea that man is in constant evolutionary motion. This approach to our life and to public consciousness has been lacking at certain stages, and this has greatly impeded us.

PRAVDA has been and remains the organ of the Communist Party's Central Committee. Together with the party we are being subjected to the most fierce attacks. But it only makes us work more vigorously and creatively in the new conditions and regard what we are doing self-critically.

As you know, it was our press that was the first to embark on the path to market relations. As a result the price of PRAVDA has increased by 150 percent. This has had a very considerable effect on subscriptions. But not the effect that many of our opponents expected. They were

expecting the party press, PRAVDA above all, to collapse and its authority in society to hit rock bottom. But it did not happen. The paper has a big enough circulation to remain one of the leading newspapers of the world. The paper has survived, it has a solid standing, and it will develop as one of the major papers of the world.

We are all now faced with new problems connected with what kind of paper to make in the future. A paper that would be the vehicle for a specific ideology as well as reporting the news. And for us this ideology is everything connected with the socialist idea, with the humane philosophy of Marxism. We will make PRAVDA a real people's paper, not only a party paper.

We will continue our cooperation with other papers and publications of the world, and above all, of course, with those that are represented here. I know you have done a great deal that merits attention, and it will be a pleasure for us to hear how you run your publications and what needs to be done to strengthen our cooperation on the basis of the utmost equality.

Certainly we should meet more regularly. It need not be on such a large scale. I believe we could hold more bilateral meetings. We invite you to attend the next PRAVDA festival. It is to be held at the beginning of May. We will also be organizing creative meetings there.

Next year PRAVDA will be 80 years old. I believe we will be arranging suitable celebrations and we will have some new problems of our development to discuss.

East-West Economic Ties Discussed

PM0104114891 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Mar 91 Union Edition p 6

[F. Lukyanov report under the "IZVESTIYA Correspondents on World Events" rubric: "Legislators for Reform—Economic Relations Between East and West Europe"]

[Text] Budapest—For the first time, parliamentary deputies from the nine countries of Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, the United States, and the FRG [as published], and leading experts from the IMF, the World Bank, and other organizations, met in Budapest on the initiative of the International Fund for the Survival and Development of Mankind for a conference on "Parliamentary Responsibility for Economic Development." In the meeting, the Soviet side was represented by USSR People's Deputies Academician Ye.P. Velikhov, Yu.V. Blokhin, K.D. Lubenchenko, and others.

In the words of Daniel Matushevskiy [name as transliterated], executive director of the fund on the American side, the threat of global war today has decreased but there is another danger—the danger of economic and then political destabilization in East European countries experiencing the difficult transition to a market economy. In an interview with IZVESTIYA, D. Matushevskiy said: "The consequences of such destabilization could prove unthinkable, and thus we consider it our duty to 'switch' to the economic sphere and try to help legislators in East European countries."

As Hungarian Prime Minister J. Antall announced when the conference opened, East European governments have to operate in very complex conditions, when the peoples of these countries are awaiting speedy and effective measures. However, the premier noted, we must not forget that the constitutional and parliamentary road to development demands considerable time and is accompanied by many contradictions.

"The main task for the Soviet government is to create a legal basis for economic reform and the market economy." Yu.V. Blokhin, head of the Soviet delegation, stated in a talk with IZVESTIYA's correspondent. "Our parliament has done a great deal in two years whatever the numerous criticisms aimed at it may imply. However, there is still a lot to be done, and so sharing our experience with those countries about to embark on similar tasks is very valuable and useful for us."

It must be said that in their speeches and interviews the Soviet parliamentarians made no secret of the difficulties accompanying the process of economic reform in the USSR. Representatives from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland talked of the problems of privatization, which, all things considered, weigh heaviest of all upon the whole region.

Finally, the International Fund for the Survival and Development of Mankind plans to create a working group comprising eminent economists and financiers, which will probably be based in Budapest and which will provide the region's countries with guidance in their endeavors to carry out economic reform.

United States & Canada

U.S. Plans for Gulf Presence Examined

LD2903220791 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Aleksey Zlatorunskiy commentary: "The Generals and the Politicians: Two Opinions"]

[Text] The commander-in-chief of the multinational forces in the Gulf, U.S. General Norman Schwarzkopf, expressed his aggressiveness on several occasions. Recently he declared that U.S. troops would stay in Iraq as long as U.S. national interests made it necessary. The negative reaction to this statement forced Washington not only to refute it, but also to rebuke the general. After a short period of time, however, the same Schwarzkopf gave an interview to the PBS television company, in which he questioned the soundness of the decision made by the U.S. Administration to stop the fighting, saying he was confident that continuing the military operations would enable him to destroy the Iraqi armed forces completely. Once again Washington was forced to disprove the general's statement.

In principle it is possible not to attach special attention to such statements made by Norman Schwarzkopf and other generals, because they are merely carrying out the will of the politicians, and do not resolve the strategic problems related to the post-crisis situation in the Gulf. Moreover, White House and the U.S. State Department representatives keep a close eye on their generals and reply quickly to their aggressive statements.

There is one aspect that has provoked noticeable circumspection in the Arab countries, however. The media reported very recently that the headquarters of the staff of the U.S. command in the Mediterranean Sea will move to Bahrain. Many observers deduced that the issue is about plans for a permanent U.S. military presence in the Gulf, particularly as reports have been coming from Bahrain itself to the effect that authorities in that country do not seem to have any objections. It has been pointed out in the U.S. capital that no plans are being made for a U.S. military presence in the Gulf. But Norman Schwarzkopf himself went to Bahrain on a 24-hour visit. AFP said in a report from Manama that Shaykh 'Isa Ibn-Salman Al Khalifa, the amir of Bahrain, had received Gen. Schwarzkopf. The talks dealt with the U.S.-Bahraini bilateral relations, and also the possibility of signing an agreement on the creation of an outpost for the U.S. Central Command in Bahrain.

Naturally, such reports should not be considered good reason for affirming that Washington says one thing while surreptitiously probing possibilities for reinforcing its presence in the Gulf. Even these reports were sufficient to provoke a negative reaction in Arab countries, particularly those countries which in the past had foreign military bases on their soil, and which know very well where this could lead. It is not coincidence that the Libyan Jamahiriyah was one of the first to talk about this. This country is in these days marking the 21st anniversary of the evacuation of the two British bases on its soil, namely the Tobruq naval base and al-Adem air base. The leader of the Libyan revolution, Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, declared on this occasion that the creation of new foreign bases on Arab soil means in the present circumstances a return to critical times for the Arabs.

People in the Soviet Union are well aware of this, and it is no coincidence that the Soviet Union, which gave its opinion on the security order in the Gulf, stated that one of the main elements of this order was a return to the size of military presence that existed prior to 1 August 1990—in order words prior to the Iraqi aggression.

U.S. Faces Conflict Over Arms Sales to Allies

PM0104140091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 91 First Edition pp 1, 5

[Article by correspondent V. Gan: "...But Cash Is a Separate Matter; Will the Near East Become an Arms Bazaar?"]

[Text] Washington—The Bush Administration was in no way expecting a dirty trick from the U.S. Congress. Hot on the heels of a triumphant victory over Iraq, it seemed that the White House should have gotten its initiatives through the Capitol without any problems.

But it turns out that although the taste of victory is still strong on their lips, making the legislators march in time to the President's drums is just as difficult as it was before.

Contemptuous of the opposition of Bush and his entourage, the Senate voted by 98 to one in favor of a ban on selling arms to U.S. allies who are slow to pay bills of exchange issued by them to the United States on the eve of the Persian Gulf war. At that time Germany, Japan, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, and a number of other countries promised Washington that they would alleviate the burden of its war expenses. The promises ran to a decent sum—$54.5 billion. At the present time the officially announced cost of the conflict to the United States is $42 billion, although according to White House representatives it could rise to $60 billion at the final count.

With the allies' bounties in mind, the administration submitted a bill on additional military appropriations on the scale of $42.6 million. The American taxpayers' share in covering the financial side of the military actions was projected at $15 billion. In the hope that the participants in the coalition would keep their word, the costs of the war for the United States with its enormous economy would come to practically nothing.

But the trouble is that the allies are not paying up. They have assigned small amounts, but the main bulk of the money has been kept back. The Saudis, for example, owe Washington $10.7 billion, Kuwait owes approximately

the same. The German debt is almost $2 billion. Japan owes even more—$9.4 billion.

The White House is unhappy, of course, but is behaving diplomatically, talking about temporary delays. Congress is not playing these games, and speaks bluntly. In the bill approved at the beginning of March, the House of Representatives, for example, announced the possibility of appropriate measures being adopted in response to the allies' financial sluggishness. After a vote in the Senate, these appropriate measures were defined, and not one of the debtor countries will receive American arms until they fulfill their promise. All of them are planning to buy arms this year.

For the administration the dilemma is not one of the most pleasant. Now the German Social Democratic Party expert Wolfgang Roth has added fuel to the fire by accusing the United States of attempting to profit from the war. According to him, Washington is dreaming of making $18 billion more than it spent on the war. There was anger in response to this statement: What do you mean, they say, the Americans paid with the lives of their soldiers, but what did you do? Of course, we are used to quarrels and gossip among allies. But all this quarreling and gossip now has an entirely different tone. Friendship is friendship, but everyone counts up his own money.

The White House's headache only got worse when the Senate voted to stop any kind of aid to Jordan. They decided to punish King Husayn for supporting the Iraqi regime during the war. Amman has been refused $55 million in the form of military and economic subsidies because of its "betrayal." This, too, despite the position of the administration, which literally made entreaties "not to complicate efforts to establish peace in the Near East." These words are taken from President Bush's special message to R. Dole, the leader of the Republicans in the Senate. White House representatives said that the United States needs Jordan in its current search for ways to find a Near East settlement. Only Jordan, they say, is in a position to help resolve the quarrel between Israel and the Palestinians....

It is possible to go on and on trying to fathom the tortuous ins and outs of what is possibly the world's most difficult and dangerous region. Borne upwards on the wings of victory euphoria, the Americans are now, it seems, no longer prepared to act in accordance with the old models of separatism. How everything will work out in practice is unclear. The intentions that have been spoken aloud by representatives of the administration currently promise, thus far, just another spiral in the arms race. President Bush himself and his Defense Secretary Cheney are basically insisting on turning the Near East into an arms bazaar again.

It is clear that the apparent simplicity of the idea of limiting the arms race is overshadowing the difficulty of its being realized. It is clear that old stereotypes are standing in the way of the search for genuine security and stability in the region. But after all, if we are talking about new thinking, then we must look for new solutions as well. In this connection THE NEW YORK TIMES writes today: "Moscow is ready. Washington, however, should avoid hasty commitments to its allies and propose its own plan." It adds: "We rarely have such an opportunity to limit the proliferation of arms as we have at the moment. Now President Bush is indeed striving for a new world order, and he can start with attempts to discuss limiting arms sales."

China

Jiang Zemin Sees 'New Stage' in Relations

LD3003175391 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] Beijing March 30 TASS—The development of good-neighbourly relations between China and the Soviet Union not only accords with the basic interests of the peoples of the two countries but is also of benefit to peace and stability in Asia and throughout the world, Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, told the president of the Japanese Newspaper Trust Chunichi Shimbun.

Certain zigzags have been observed in the history of the development of Sino-Soviet relations over the past 40 years, Jiang Zemin said.

All that has receded into the past now. Since May 1989 when Mikhail Gorbachev visited China, relations between the two countries have entered a qualitatively new stage. This signifies that relations between China and the Soviet Union are based on the five principles of peaceful co-existence, he said.

Over the past two years, the two countries have made strides in the development of contacts in all fields. This does not mean at all that there are no problems between the two countries, Jiang Zemin emphasised.

He said that the border issue has not been resolved to the full up to now. The Soviet Union is the largest country neighbouring on China.

"The two countries, observing the five principles of peaceful co-existence and renouncing interference in the internal affairs of each other, will certainly be able to improve the renewed relations between them. We do not have the slightest doubt about that," Jiang Zemin said.

He announced that he would visit the Soviet Union in the second half of May this year.

1991 Trade Protocol Signed With China

LD2703185991 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 27 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent V. Kulikov in Beijing, date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] An intergovernmental protocol on trade and economic cooperation between the USSR and China for 1991 has been signed in Beijing.

[Begin recording] [A.I. Kochanov, USSR deputy minister of foreign economic relations] We think this document is significantly important, since it opens up a new stage in our cooperation.

[Tong Zhiguang, Chinese deputy foreign minister in vernacular with superimposed Russian translation] I agree that a new situation has arisen in our trade and economic relations, and I hope that cooperation at this stage is going to develop and bring us mutual benefits. [end recording]

[Kulikov] The new element in trade and economic relations between the USSR and China consists in our countries going over since the beginning of the year to the settlement of accounts in convertible currency. Considering the limited hard currency resources, both in our country and in China, this could have become an obstacle in our economic relations. But this did not happen. In contrast to the approach to this problem by some East European countries, where a similar situation is alas leading to a mutually disadvantageous decline in relations, there is a growing trend in Soviet-Chinese trade.

The protocol signed in Beijing shows the sides have found mutually acceptable options for settling accounts. For instance, our deliveries of machinery and equipment for Chinese heat and power stations will be paid for by repairs to Soviet fishing ships in Chinese docks. Motor cars, petrochemical products, and aviation and other equipment sent to China will encounter a reverse flow of goods, mainly consumer—grain, meat, tea, knitwear, and footwear. The volume of our trade in 1991 will amount to more than 3 billion rubles.

PRC Foreign Minister Holds News Conference

PM0104091191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent Yu. Savenkov: "Chinese Democracy in a Changing World. PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen's News Conference"]

[Text] Beijing—The peaceful political resolution of international disputes and regional conflicts should be the norm of international behavior. The use of force should be avoided. The Gulf War by no means revoked these generally accepted norms, and it should not become a precedent for the resolution of conflicts by the use of force. This idea was voiced by PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, opening a series of traditional news conferences within the framework of the Chinese National People's Congress session currently being held in Beijing.

This is a new point. Foreign policy problems have usually received more modest attention at Chinese legislature sessions. The foreign minister was meeting with journalists at a time when he was very busy. Currently, in the context of the changes in the international arena—particularly the social and political shifts in East Europe and the postwar realities in the Gulf region—Chinese diplomacy has become more active. Premier Li Peng also devoted great attention to foreign policy in the government report, noting the sudden changes in the international situation and the violation of the world's old architectonics which have existed for over 40 years. Here is how Beijing assesses events. Soviet-U.S. relations have eased. Military confrontation has weakened and a trend has emerged toward a multipolar world. But hegemonism and strong-arm policies continue to develop. A number of political, economic, and national contradictions that were previously hidden have become more obvious. The new correlation of forces is leading to discord, and there is a growing gap between the rich "North" and the poor "South." The interweaving of old and new contradictions is, in Beijing's view, making the international situation worrying and changeable.

Foreign Minister Qian Qichen reaffirmed at the news conference that China resolutely rejects hegemonism, but it does not link the actual concept of hegemonism to specific countries. It is a question of actions which undermine the accepted norms of international behavior. He recalled that both Sino-U.S. and Sino-Soviet communiques contain points rejecting hegemonism and recognizing the need to seek opportunities to put an end to it.

Assessing the subject of human rights—a tradition at such news conferences—Qian Qichen disagreed with the claim that there is no end to this problem. From the international-law standpoint, the minister believes, human rights can only be guaranteed by acts of legislation in each specific country.

Assessing the forthcoming visit to Beijing by Soviet Foreign Minister A. Bessmertnykh, Qian Qichen called it a working visit. As two of the permanent members of the UN Security Council, he said, we bear a great responsibility for the fate of peace, and consultations on important international problems are quite natural. Moreover, the details of the forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, will also be discussed. This will be the first visit to our country by the Chinese Communist leader in 33 years.

Qian Qichen resolutely rejected the rumors that China is expecting weapons shipments from the Soviet Union in response to the preferential trade credit of 1 billion Swiss francs which it recently provided. Under the agreement, the minister noted, weapons are not included on the list of goods which the Soviet Union will use to pay off the credit. At the same time, the Chinese minister expressed the hope that countries which are major weapons exporters will take effective measures to restrain arms

sales. China itself, the minister stated, takes a serious and responsible position and sells only a strictly limited number of armaments.

Northeast Asia

Reportage on Bessmertnykh's Visit to Japan

Met by Legislators 29 Mar

LD2903212991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, arrived in Tokyo today on an official visit. He was met at Haneda Airport by Muneo Suzuki, legislative deputy minister of foreign affairs of Japan, and other officials. Andrey Kozyrev, minister of foreign affairs of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, is a member of the delegation. Aleksandr Bessmertnykh made a statement upon arrival. In particular, he said:

[Begin Bessmertnykh recording] The Soviet Union and Japan are two neighboring great powers. It is not only the climate in the Asian and in the Pacific Ocean regions that depends to a significant extent on how relations between them take shape. [end recording]

Makes Arrival Statement

LD2903054591 Moscow TASS in English 0523 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Text] Tokyo March 29 TASS—"It is a great pleasure to arrive in Tokyo for important talks, which would focus primarily on preparations for Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan," Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said today on arrival in the Japanese capital.

"The Soviet Union and Japan are two great neighbouring powers and relations between them have a major impact on the climate both in the Asian-Pacific region and the world," Bessmertnykh said.

"This is true both for the present and, especially, for the future century we are about to enter. Let us look into the future. We want the barometer of our relations to read 'clear' and are prepared to work, seek and find acceptable solutions to even the most difficult problems between us," he said.

"We hope that forthcoming talks with Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama and prominent Japanese political figures would create a solid groundwork for a successful and productive (Soviet-Japanese) summit," he said.

"The Soviet Union greatly respects Japan and its hard-working people and hopes that the forthcoming visit by the Soviet president—the first such visit in the history of Soviet-Japanese relations—will help open a new era in our relations—the era of goodneighbourliness and cooperation," he said.

"This is my first visit to Japan and my dream to visit this country has materialised. I want to use the occasion to pass my best wishes to Tokyo residents and all the Japanese people."

Meets Japanese Counterpart

LD2903161591 Moscow TASS in English 1559 GMT 29 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kopnov and Vladimir Kuchko]

[Text] Tokyo March 29 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, who came here for an official visit within the framework of preparation of the Soviet-Japanese summit, held today the first round of talks with his Japanese counterpart Taro Nakayama. They discussed in detail a wide range of international problems.

A joint analysis of the Gulf conflict and ways to a post-crisis settlement revealed that there is much in common in the two countries' approaches to this problem. Pointing to the importance of Soviet-American cooperation for the liberation of Kuwait, the Japanese foreign minister expressed hope that close Soviet-American contacts would be continued in the interests of international stability. Bessmertnykh stressed that Soviet-American cooperation, with all its importance and key role in ensuring international stability, which were demonstrated during the Gulf crisis, does not move to the background for the Soviet Union the significance of cooperation with other countries, including Japan.

Describing the present state of Soviet-American relations at the request of the Japanese side, Bessmertnykh said that despite natural difficulties that have to be overcome, positive trends still predominate in these relations.

During the discussion of disarmament problems, Bessmertnykh explained the Japanese foreign minister the situation with the implementation of the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe. It was pointed out that the transfer of some Soviet armaments to the area across the Urals does not mean Soviet military buildup in the Far Eastern region.

The Japanese side raised the problem of lifting the articles of the U.N. Charter about enemy states and expressed hope that the Soviet Union would display understanding and support Japan on this issue. The Soviet minister agreed that those articles of the U.N. Charter were an anachronism and said that the situation should be changed, with due account, however, for the need for preserving the U.N. Charter.

The talks between the Soviet and Japanese foreign ministers will be continued on Saturday.

Sees Hiroshima Official

LD3003025191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1435 GMT 29 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kopnov and Vladimir Kuchko]

[Excerpts] Tokyo, 29 Mar (TASS)—[passage omitted] Takasi Hiraoku, Mayor of Hiroshima [title as received], today received USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh. The name Hiroshima, the minister stressed, lives in the consciousness of Soviet people as a symbol of the cruelty of war, but at the same time reminds of the strength of the spirit of the Japanese people and their constructive possibilities. The minister welcomed the long and broad contacts which Hiroshima maintains with the Soviet Union, being the twin city of Volgograd, and expressed gratitude to the authorities and specialists of that Japanese city for support and cooperation in the matter of overcoming the Chernobyl disaster.

Meets Japanese Premier 30 Mar

LD3003125791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1235 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] Tokyo, 30 Mar (TASS)—Toshiki Kaifu, prime minister of Japan, today received USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, who is here on an official visit. The Soviet minister handed over a personal message from USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev to the head of the Japanese Government. Their thorough exchange of views focused primarily on the issues of bilateral relations in the light of the forthcoming visit to Japan in April by the head of the Soviet state.

Toshiki Kaifu stated that Japan supports the restructuring which is taking place in the Soviet Union. He voiced the hope that the historic visit by Mikhail Gorbachev will make possible a fundamental improvement in bilateral relations by giving them a really amicable and stable character.

Holds News Conference

LD3003175491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1105 GMT 30 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kopnov, Vladimir Kuchko, and Vladimir Solntsev]

[Text] Tokyo, 30 Mar (TASS)—The Soviet Union and Japan are convinced that USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Tokyo, due in April, "will become an historic event which will mark a new quality of relations between our two great neighboring states". It can be said without exaggeration that the very prospect of the first ever visit to Japan by a leader of the Soviet state take place "has given a powerful spur and additional dynamism to the development of relations between our two countries." This was stated today by USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh, who is in Tokyo on an official visit. Speaking at a news conference, he summed up his talks with Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama and his conversation with Prime Minister Tosiki Kaifu, the aim of which was to complete the practical preparation of the Soviet-Japanese summit meeting.

The Soviet minister pointed out that some 15 agreements were prepared for signing during the summit. Their conclusion will substantially broaden the treaty law base of Soviet-Japanese relations in the most diverse areas: political, trade and economic, scientific and technical, and cultural and humanitarian. "We will not rest with that; we will afterward make even more progress," he stressed.

The sides discussed additionally the program of M.S. Gorbachev's visit, the minister reported. It promises to be strenuous and rich in content. Along with M.S. Gorbachev's conversations with Premier Tosiku Kaifu, which will take up a central place in the program, the Soviet president will have several meetings with figures in Japan's political and business world and will get to know the country and its people.

"At present the time has come in Soviet-Japanese relations, and indeed in international relations as a whole, to free ourselves of anachronisms," A.A. Bessmertnykh said. "The need for this is being felt especially each time when the problem of the peace treaty, which still does not exist between the USSR and Japan, is broached. We discussed this problem, too, of course. It is obvious that it will be the subject of the most detailed examination also in the course of the summit meeting, including also such a sensitive aspect as territorial demarcation. We are in favor of an active search for mutually acceptable solutions, for an unprejudiced, straight, and open view of things. Without this it is probably impossible to get near to resolving tasks that combine in them the intricacies of numerous political, historical, and legal arguments and a high degree of emotionality, evoked by the fact that people's patriotic feelings are affected."

"We assume that it is necessary to assess the situation in a balanced and sober fashion and on this basis to make a realistic selection from among the various options for a solution. I think that both sides understand this and, strengthening trust and qualitatively improving the atmosphere of interrelations, will respond by releasing broad flows of cooperation and will arrive at mutually acceptable solutions even for the most difficult questions".

The head of the Soviet foreign policy department pointed out that in the course of the talks with his Japanese colleague, Taro Nakayama, a wide range of international problems was discussed, including a post-crisis settlement in the Persian Gulf, the prospects for the development of the situation in the Asian-Pacific region, the Korean peninsula, and a Cambodian settlement. "We have highlighted not only the circumstance that the USSR and Japan are equally interested in removing tension where it exists, but also the fact that the approaches and positions of the two countries in

many aspects are close or coincide; mutual understanding is becoming increasingly wide and definite," the minister said. He noted the accord reached by the sides on expanding the practice of expert consultations between the foreign ministries of the USSR and Japan on foreign policy matters.

Meets Counterpart on Peace Treaty

LD3003131791 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 30 Mar 91

[TASS headline: "Joint Soviet-Japanese Communique Published"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Bessmertnykh and Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama continued to discuss issues related to Gorbachev's official visit to Japan. The ministers confirmed that they shared the view that Gorbachev's visit to Japan is meant to ensure a drastic improvement in Soviet-Japanese relations, update them and make an important contribution towards ensuring peace and prosperity in the Asian-Pacific Region and the world.

In conjunction with practical preparations for Gorbachev's visit to Japan, the ministers expressed satisfaction that work on several documents, the agreement to prepare which was reached earlier, was basically completed and work to elaborate documents in the field of air traffic and the study of modern-day Japan is in progress.

Under an agreement recorded in the joint Soviet-Japanese statement of October 10, 1973, the ministers continued talks concerning the conclusion of a Soviet-Japanese peace treaty. During talks, the sides laid down their understanding of aspects linked with eliminating difficulties in bilateral relations and agreed to help achieve further progress at talks. These talks aim to make sure that by concluding a peace treaty, the two countries will open a new era in bilateral relations.

During their regular meeting, the two countries' foreign ministers exchanged views on other urgent issues of Soviet-Japanese relations and on a wide range of international problems of mutual interest, including the situation in the Gulf, the problems of the Asian-Pacific region, the situation on the Korean peninsula and a Cambodian settlement.

Bessmertnykh invited Nakayama to pay an official visit to the USSR in 1991. The invitation was accepted with gratitude. The terms for the visit will be agreed upon via diplomatic channels.

The Soviet side was represented at the talks by Russian Foreign Minister A. Kozyrev, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister I. Rogachev and Soviet Ambassador to Japan L. Chizhov.

The Japanese side [was represented at the talks] by Japanese ambassador to the USSR Sumio Edamura and Deputy Foreign Minister Hisashi Owada.

The talks in Tokyo passed in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere and were substantive and useful to both sides.

Talks End

LD3003165191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1430 GMT 30 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kopnov and Vladimir Kuchko]

[Text] Tokyo, 30 Mar (TASS)—Talks between USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, who is here on an official visit, and Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama finished today at the reception building of the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The second round of the talks was primarily devoted to the discussion of the complex of Soviet-Japanese relations as well as the questions regarding the practical preparations for the forthcoming official visit by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev to Japan in April. In connection with this, the sides have noted that this visit will take place at a time when the development of the international situation is going through a very important stage. They have expressed hope for the success of the first bilateral summit, which is expected to open up a new page in the relations between the Soviet Union and Japan.

The ministers have also paid close attention to the questions of security in the Asian-Pacific region and have exchanged views on the situation in the Korean peninsula and on the process of the peace settlement in Cambodia. Taro Nakayama discussed the course of negotiations with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the subject of establishing bilateral diplomatic relations.

Begins Brief Country Tour

LD3103020291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0124 GMT 31 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kuchko]

[Text] Tokyo, 31 mar (TASS)—USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, having completed the official part of the program of his visit to Japan, today left on a brief tour of the country. He was seen off at Tokyo station by Taro Nakayama, the Japanese minister of foreign affairs. The Soviet minister will visit Kyoto, the ancient Japanese capital, and will leave Japan from Osaka Airport this evening.

Visit Results Summarized

OW3103045291 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh is in Japan for an official visit. In this connection, a Moscow Radio reporter reports as follows:

Here in Tokyo, people show great interest in the Soviet-Japanese negotiations, which are of great importance. This is because the negotiations will also become the final preparations for President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan slated for mid-April. Concrete results have already been reached at negotiations between Soviet Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh and Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama. Both leaders jointly analyzed lessens learned from the Gulf conflict and the methods of a postwar settlement. They discovered that there is much in common with the positions of the Soviet Union and Japan. Stressing the role of mutual cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States in freeing Kuwait, Foreign Minister Nakayama expressed his hope that the Soviet Union and the United States would continue to maintain their close contacts for stability in the international community. In response, Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh pointed out that despite natural difficulties that have to be overcome, positive trends generally predominate in Soviet-U.S. ties. Moreover, both foreign ministers exchanged views on the issue of disarmament. Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh said that some Soviet armaments will be transfered from Europe to the eastern area of the Urals. He also said, however, that a Soviet military buildup will not be seen in the Far Eastern region.

Of late, the territories issue is widely talked about in Tokyo. This is a territorial dispute regarding a return of the four Kuril islands. This issue was talked about at the second round of Bessmertnykh-Nakayama talks held on Saturday [30 March].

President Gorbachev recently said: We are planning to give impetus to peace treaty negotiations. On the condition of achieving the maximum amount of fairness, we are ready to study and settle all problems during the negotiations.

People in Tokyo frequently refer to this remark by the president. In this connection, I would like to point out the fact that Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu responded, saying that President Gorbachev took a more flexible stance regarding the northern territories issue.

This has been a report regarding Soviet Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh's visit to Japan.

Japanese Coverage Noted

WA2903165491

For Japanese media coverage of the three-day stay of Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, including his work on preparations for the April visit of President Gorbachev, and his meetings with Japanes Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama, see the Japan section of the 29 March and subsequent issues of the East Asia DAILY REPORT.

Differences Continue With Japan Over Territories

Visits Address Debate

PM2803152191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent I. Latyshev under the rubric "Japan-USSR": "Contradictory Positions"]

[Text] Tokyo, 27 Mar—Soviet-Japanese relations are being discussed widely nowadays in the Japanese press and in other mass media. This is natural: Just three weeks remain until USSR President M.S. Gorbachev arrives in Japan, while A.A. Bessmertnykh, the Soviet Union's foreign minister, is expected in Japan at the end of this week.

Chief attention in the debate is devoted to the so-called "territorial question." What is meant by this here are the Japanese claims to four southern islands of the Kuril archipelago: Kunashir, Iturup, Khabomay, and Shikotan.

Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu and the leaders of the Japanese Foreign Ministry emphasize their adherence to the former official position proposing the advancement of a demand for the simultaneous transfer to Japan of all four islands without delay as an initial precondition for the full normalization of Japanese-Soviet relations.

Individual leaders of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party, including Ichiro Ozawa, its general secretary, take a somewhat different stand. The policy of Ozawa's supporters, which is shared by certain influential leaders of the country's business world and, in particular, by Gaysi Khiraiva [name as transliterated], president of the Federation of Economic Organizations, boils down to the fact that, for tactical reasons, Japan ought to abandon the demand for the simultaneous transfer of the four islands and choose a different tactic: demand that the Soviet Union merely recognize at this moment Japan's sovereignty over all four aforesaid islands and promise to transfer these islands to it in the future. At the present stage Ozawa and his supporters deem it possible to confine themselves just to securing the Soviet Union's consent to the transfer of two of the four islands to the Japanese side without delay: Habomai and Shikotan. They are mentioned in the Soviet-Japanese Joint Declaration on the Normalization of Relations Between the USSR and Japan, which was signed in October 1956 and still remains the juridical basis of our relations (as is known, the declaration proclaimed the Soviet Union's readiness to transfer these two islands to Japan after the conclusion of a peace treaty between the two countries).

A new feature of the stand taken by Ozawa's supporters is also the fact that they emphasize in every possible way that, in the event of the Japanese conditions' being fulfilled, large-scale government credits will be made available to the Soviet Union (up to $26-28 billion). In addition, Japan would be prepared to conclude various

economic agreements reinforced by government guarantees and providing for an expansion of business contacts both in developing the natural resources of Siberia and the Far East and in the sphere of joint enterprise.

A characteristic feature of the debate now is that both the supporters of the former course and the followers of the new one are continuing to link territorial demands closely with the further development of Japanese-Soviet economic contacts.

Solution to 'Impasse' Suggested

91UF0584A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 12, 27 Mar 91 p 4

[Article by Vladimir Yeremin, candidate of juridical sciences, under the rubric "Point of View": "USSR-Japan: We Will Overcome the Impasse]

[Text] The USSR president is going on a visit to Tokyo. We are all hoping for positive results from this trip, although we know very little about the impending initiatives of the Soviet side at the negotiations.

It appears that the process of filling the portfolio, which will be opened by the president in Tokyo, would be more complete and public with the participation of four partners: people's deputies, science, the public, and the diplomatic department. Actually, the lion's share of preparatory work, as always, was accomplished behind the closed doors of a tall building on Smolensk street. But would it not have been useful to create a unit (commission, group) of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies especially for participation in preparation for the visit and even for monitoring it? As for science, it is impossible to consider as adequate the conduct of such unquestionably useful measures as acting out an "international court" on the territorial question in the State and Law Institute, and a seminar on "problems in the verification of Soviet-Japanese relations" in the Moscow State Institute of International Relations, etc. It is more likely that a series was needed, I would say, of unrestricted forums from which could be heard loud and clear, in particular, the growing force of scientific criticism of the historical, international legal, economic, and military aspects of the argumentation of our official position on the territorial dispute.

Powerful social forces are not involved in the work of the resolution of the territorial dispute, and, indeed, they cannot energetically and competently take part in it, because of an almost complete lack of information (or because of one-sided information) and the lack of an organizing principle. The farther we go, the more speeches appear on the pages of the press devoted to Soviet-Japanese relations by representatives of the most diverse groups of our society from various regions of the country, including the Far East. A part of these speeches are distinguished by their profound persuasiveness and calm tone, but there are also superficial judgments and sharp notes. Few know what versions are being offered by the Japanese side, what they are based on, and the consequences they entail. Pluralism and publicity of the diplomatic process on the Japanese sector and giving the process a national character presuppose a system of providing the masses access to knowledge of the existence of the Soviet-Japanese disagreements, with total objectivity in presenting the information, which will prepare the people to carry out the national verdict. More self-restraint and less heated passions (the last also is frequently the result of inadequate information).

Considering the great controversy and glasnost, the process being examined would better enter into the strategy of the new foreign policy thinking, and the president would receive an opportunity to rely on the opinion of all four partners in preparation for the visit.

Thus, will the visit mature and will it be able to lead Soviet-Japanese relations out of the impasse and renew them fundamentally? Finally, do the aforementioned judgments make any sense, inasmuch as only a few days remain before the visit?

I answer the first of the stated questions positively, and this in no way contradicts the critical remarks that I made. The Soviet side can really make a gigantic breakthrough in Tokyo. This is possible if the existence and paramount importance of the territorial question are recognized, and if it is also recognized that today the official position of the Japanese side is supported by an overwhelming majority of the people of Japan: We should not make our former reasoning absolute anymore (historical, international legal, economic, and military), and we should declare that there are no limitations on the resolution of the territorial question: We should reach a decision on the development in the USSR of a national program on the territorial problem (including informing the Soviet people about the proposals and reasons of the Japanese side), with the assignment of a key role to representational institutions, science, and the public; and we should invite Japanese legislators, scientists, and public figures to joint work on the territorial question in mixed collectives (of the type of the projected independent Soviet-Japanese institute of political and social problems). Openness and objectivity and the resoluteness to achieve a genuine renewal can be affirmed by recognition of the responsibility for deviating from legal norms when the USSR went to war with Japan in 1945 and for incidents of improper treatment of Japanese prisoners of war. We must also affirm our obligations under the joint declaration of 1946, first and foremost about transferring the islands of Habomai and Shikotan to Japan after the signing of a peace treaty.

In answer to the second question, I would like to say that the visit of the president must at least provide the beginning of a qualitatively new epoch in Soviet-Japanese relations, when new forces from our side will advance with their still unclaimed potential and when an atmosphere of confidence will evolve between the two countries and final decisions will be made. Here, God grant, my ideas will also prove useful.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Thai-Vietnamese Ties, Cambodia Settlement Viewed

BK2403053891 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 23 Mar 91

[Station observer (Oleg Alekseyev) commentary]

[Text] XINHUA, referring to credible informed sources in Bangkok, has reported that Vietnam will send its deputy foreign minister to Thailand in April to discuss and arrange for a meeting between the prime ministers of the two countries. The meeting was planned by the former civil Thai Government, which was overthrown in a military coup on 23 February. Here is a commentary in this connection by our observer (Oleg Alekseyev).

Thailand's military leadership has officially announced its readiness to improve relations with Vietnam. In a recent statement, the coup leader, General Sunthon Khongsomphong, has ordered the interim Thai government to arrange for a visit to Vietnam in the near future. As such, it seems that in the future there will be not only a meeting between Thai Prime Minister Anan Panyarachun and his Vietnamese counterpart Do Muoi, but also a visit by the Thai leadership to Hanoi. The Bangkok leaders will continue to implement the policy of the former Thai Government toward Vietnam, and the continued implementation of the policy is reflected by General Khongsomphong's order to curb activities carried out by the anti-Vietnamese exiles on Thai soil and to disarm them.

The leaders in Bangkok have also adopted a constructive stance toward another Indochinese state, namely Laos. Lately, the two countries have withdrawn their troops from a common Thai-Lao border area.

In view of the Thai leadership's policy toward Indochina, we should not ignore its stance on Cambodia as well as on a settlement of the Cambodian problem. At the time when the Thai Army first took over power, the Cambodian opposition groups expressed hope that they would received huge support and assistance in their fighting against Phnom Penh. Can their expectation come true? As far as we know, there is still no answer to this question so far.

In a recent meeting with the Vietnamese ambassador in Bangkok, Thai Foreign Minister Sarasin has reiterated Thailand's interest in promoting cooperation with Vietnam to settle the Cambodian problem via a political solution. Meanwhile, officials in Bangkok have however warned that hope should not be placed on Thailand's active role as a mediator. Moreover, Bangkok's statements with respect to Phnom Penh have become remarkably tough.

Southeast Asian Territorial Disputes Viewed

HK2503041691 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 24 Mar 91

[Aleksey Nikolayev commentary]

[Text] What should be done to radically improve the situation in Southeast Asia? In the opinion of experts in the region, the turmoil in Cambodia is the main issue that should be resolved. Hopes are that initial moves to settle this issue are successful.

There are, however, other problems in the region. One of these is the question of who owns some islands in the South China Sea. The islands are known by various names, depending on who claims them. They have been called the Spratly Islands, Nanshas, (Changsa) and Kalayaan [Freedom]. The archipelago, which is made up of 500 small and large islands, covers an area of 600 kilometers. Some of the claimants are the Philippines, Vietnam, China, and Malaysia.

There is also a Taiwanese garrison is on one of the islands, and other claimants have taken up positions as proof of their ownership. Events have shown that these territorial disputes will not be easily settled.

Recently Philippine Armed Forces Chief of Staff General Rodolfo Biazon visited the islands and declared that Filipino soldiers based there should be placed on alert. This is because Manila believes the island may be taken over by the other countries who might covet its mineral resources. Biazon said the islands could become a point of regional contention.

It is not surprising that other countries claiming the islands think in the same way as General Biazon. A statement by Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas said that there must be mutual agreement about the islands among the countries involved. He said a dialogue should be held on the issue so as to achieve understanding, as well as peace and stability in Southeast Asia.

East Europe

Outcome of Albanian Elections Pondered

PM0104094191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Apr 91 Second Edition p 6

[Report by special correspondent Ye. Fadeyev: "On Whom Will Victory Smile?"]

[Text] Tirana, 31 Mar—Multiparty legislative elections got underway in Albania at 0600 hours today. At first glance, Tirana is treating this event—the first ever in the republic's history—almost as a non-event. There is no sign of the multitude of propaganda posters, bright slogans, and imperative appeals. Only in the capital's center can one notice the Democratic Party's blue posters depicting two raised fingers in the shape of the

Latin "V" for victory, together with a few photographs and biographical details of candidate deputies.

This lack of agitation is not surprising—the country is in a difficult financial situation, paper is in short supply. The 250 seats in the Albanian People's Assembly (legislature) are being contested by candidates from the ruling Albanian Workers' Party [AWP] and four recently formed opposition parties—the Democratic Party, the ecological "Green" Party, the Agrarian Party, and the Republican Party, and from various public organizations like the Democratic Front, the women's and youth organizations, and the veterans' union. The elected deputies will have to tackle the formation of the republic's government and the creation of a new constitution for the country.

A "pre-election silence" was proclaimed in the 24 hours prior to Sunday. It started after representatives of all five parties spoke on Tirana Television for five minutes each.

The AWP's main rival is the Democratic Party, created on the crest of the wave of students' demonstrations last December. Its core comprises mainly former AWP members. Its leaders are also former communists—35-year old economist and university dotsent G. Pashko [name as transliterated], and famous cardiologist Dr. S. Berisha [name as transliterated].

Whereas the nucleus of the AWP's program is to advance along the socialist path of development, the Democratic Party's calls for Western orientation, transition to market economy, introduction of private property, and accelerated alignment with Europe. The democrats have no doubts about their election victory. At least this is what S. Berisha categorically declared at a news conference for journalists from all over the world who are accredited here. But what will actually happen? After all, 60 percent of voters live in the countryside where hardly anyone has even heard of the Democratic Party.

For their part, the communists have no doubts about their success, either. "We have already taken the path of democratization and will continue to confidently advance along it. This path, if compared against other East European countries, is our own and different from all the others," AWP leader R. Alia declared at his news conference. "Albania is a small country. We badly need unity with all parties despite the existing differences. I personally would like to see all political forces cooperating in a coalition for the sake of Albania, its people, and its future."

The democratic party rejected out of hand the idea of a possible coalition.

But no matter what the election's outcome, commentators note, the political situation in the country will remain tense for some time to come. If the democrats were to emerge victorious, being unskilled nonprofessionals, they would find it hard to master the situation and perceive the essence of state problems, while a series of powerful institutions would remain in the Communists' hands. Like the Army, for example. If the AWP were to gain victory, it would gain neither understanding nor support from the democrats. Having lost, they would of course refuse to play a minor part and would struggle for their ideas and program, especially among the rural population. The most important issue is this: Victory in today's election will determine the path to be followed by Albania in the future—the socialist path, or the capitalist one as advocated by the Democratic Party.

Speaking on television, R. Meydani [name as transliterated], chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, declared that honest struggle is being guaranteed at the election, and any possibility of manipulating the voting procedure has been ruled out. Representatives of all parties are included in electoral commissions at all levels. The commissions' activity and the course of the election will be monitored by observers from the legislatures of various countries, including the Soviet Union, who have arrived in Tirana. The voting will end at 2000 hours and the preliminary results will be announced Tuesday [2 April].

And so, the first multiparty elections are underway in Albania, the "last stronghold of Stalinism," as Western journalists like to dub it. Had this been announced even three years ago, nobody would have believed it. But life is marching on. Events in East Europe resounded all over the world and have transformed ideas about many things.

"There is no doubt that a huge step forward has been taken in our country in the human rights sphere. This is why now it is especially important to prevent anarchy because it would produce nothing good and is fraught with the emergence of a terrible dictatorship," D. Agolli, chairman of Albania's Writers and Artists Union, said.

I would like to end today's report from Tirana on this note.

Latin America & Caribbean

Diplomatic Relations Established With Panama

PM2903172991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 91 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Diplomatic Relations Established"]

[Text] The permanent UN representatives of the USSR and Panama signed a joint communique in New York 29 March on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries.

The document notes that the USSR and the Republic of Panama, guided by their mutual desire to develop relations of friendship and cooperation between the two countries in the political, trade, economic, and other spheres, have decided to establish diplomatic relations at the level of embassies as from the date of the signing of the joint communique.

The sides have agreed that, at this stage, a USSR Consulate General will open in Panama City and a consulate general of the Republic of Panama will open in Moscow.

The document notes that the two sides will develop mutual relations on the basis of the principles of equality of states, mutual respect for each other's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity, self-determination, and noninterference in the internal affairs of the other state in accordance with the UN Charter.

Both sides expressed confidence that the establishement of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the Republic of Panama is in keeping with the interests of both countries and will promote the strengthening of international cooperation and universal peace.

Cubans Sense Danger From U.S. Gulf Victory

LD3003143291 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] Fundamental changes in the world have provoked a mixed reaction in different countries. Our correspondent, Viktor Gorbachev, reports that after the end of the armed conflict in the Persian Gulf the world seems gloomy as viewed from Havana.

Now they believe in Havana that there is only one superpower left on the globe—it possesses military, economic, political, and ideological power—and this country is the United States, the worst enemy of the Cuban revolution. The Soviet Union, Cuba's main ally, still has the military and political potential, however it already lacks its ideological influence and economic power. On the whole, the two-pole world, when the American imperialism was confronted by the mighty Soviet Union and a united socialist system, has now become one pole. According to the Cuban leadership it was reflected in full measure during the Gulf conflict. It is only in these new conditions that the United States could impose the United Nations Security Council a military solution. [sentence as heard] After an easy victory over Iraq the situation in the world has become even worse.

Fidel Castro recently said the Yankees feel master of the planet. They want to establish their own world order. Now Americans will become even more aggressive and Washington will more easily use military force. Cubans believe that in the near future this can happen anywhere in the Third World. Even before the Gulf conflict, Cuba anticipated an aggression. Now its sense of danger has become more acute, especially because the United States has demonstrated its military and technological might in all its glory. In one of his recent speeches, Fidel Castro specially dwelt on the reasons of Iraq's defeat. He pointed to the mistakes of the Iraqi leadership and explained why the American troops achieved an easy victory in Grenada and Panama. The Cuban leader stressed that in case of intervention his people will struggle differently. He said that the Cubans would really fight and the Americans will be defeated on the island.

This is not only the opinion of the higher echelon of power. One of my acquaintances said that the Cubans have made their own conclusions and made some changes in their defenses. For example, if earlier they built bomb shelters at a depth of, say, 10 meters, now they will go as deep as 20 meters. The people will fight until their complete victory.

The Cubans think that the world has lost its former balance, has become more dangerous, that under these conditions it is still possible to withstand single-handedly.

Supreme Soviet Session

29 March Session Proceedings Detailed

LD3003001191

Moscow Central Televison Second Program Network in Russian at 1853 GMT on 29 March carries a recorded account of proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow on 29 March.

Interior Minister Boris Pugo speaks about the 28 March Moscow rally. He says that about 50,000 people took part, rather than the hundreds of thousands reported by some media. Special troops were not pulled out, as they were never there in the first place, he declares. He says the same goes for military hardware. Anticommunist slogans were chanted; the situation almost got out of control, he states. Traffic was disrupted, and militiamen were insulted. Hooligans had guns. He goes on to say that some people's deputies incited offenses, and youths refused to disperse; many were drunk, offensive, and threatening. The militia used shields but had a hard time, he says, adding that similar gatherings took place in only six other cities. The Interior Ministry is ensuring order in Moscow, he concludes.

Questions begin. An unidentified questioner asks: "Yesterday at a meeting at the session, esteemed Deputy Sobchak stated that he said in the interval that he'd seen machine-gunners or servicemen—(?I'm not quoting him) word for word, but he said this. I'd like to clarify whether that did indeed take place or not."

Pugo answers: "I can report, comrade deputies, that unfortunately Comrade Sobchak isn't here, but he himself—after the session evidently, or in the recess—went there again to the Kremlin [corrects himself] Kamennyy Bridge, visited the scene. He entered several buses that were standing there, examined the vehicles, met the servicemen, but didn't find anything, because there could not have been any automatic weapons there. But it would have been better if he had told us about it himself. In general it seems a deputy has the right to check, but it's better if he then confirms it in his own words."

Deputy (Pezhiy]) then asks: "Esteemed Boris Karlovich, so that distorted data are not used in the press, please state the figures on how many militia, internal troops, and Army personnel took part yesterday in protecting public order in Moscow. I ask because I heard with my own ears a journalist reporting from here, from our foyer, the figure that 50,000 men were deployed. I'd like you to..."

Pugo interrupts: "I gave that figure yesterday: In the region of 50,000 men."

Another unidentified questioner asks: "Boris Karlovich, such [word indistinct] measures to keep the peace are very expensive. Each of us who has a real idea of technical matters can imagine how much gas was burned up, how much money was spent. All these services are financed from the budget; in other words, it comes out of the taxpayer's pocket. If they want to do something in one city, why does the whole country have to pick up the bill? Question: Could you give us an idea how much this whole event cost and who will bear the expense?"

Pugo responds: "Well, judging by the previous meeting which took place, the Moscow militia claimed from the Moscow Soviet the sum of R700,000. I think this time the sum is considerably greater. In fact it's the organizers who really ought to have been presented with the bill."

Deputy Martirosyan deplores the incident. The military radio station 142 was involved, he says, asserting that he saw no military equipment near the Kremlin, only trucks. A deputy says yesterday's lesson must be learned. Another says law and order must be restored.

A deputy quotes the KURANTY newspaper and speaks about the unrest in South Ossetia.

At 1912 GMT Supreme Soviet Chairman Lukyanov proposes that the report on the Moscow incident be noted. The proposal is passed.

The announcer says that the private enterprise law was then debated, and that the next full session will be on 1 April. The program then concludes.

Pugo Address

LD3003213191 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1854 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Speech by USSR Interior Minister Boris Pugo at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow on 29 March—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies: Under resolutions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, rallies and demonstrations [demonstratsiya] were not permitted on 28 March in Moscow's Manezh Square and Red Square. Nevertheless, large-scale events were held between 1700 and 2100 hours in Arbat Square, Pushkin Square, and Mayakovskiy Square in response to calls from supporters of the Democratic Russia movement, among them a number of USSR and RSFSR people's deputies and Moscow Soviet deputies—events in which some 50,000 people took part, though the foreign media have been mentioning figures of 200,000 or 300,000 and there was even one broadcast which talked of a gathering of about a million. But this is the usual story of how the organizers of such things like to portray the results of their labors.

Many questions are being asked—and I myself have been asked by journalists today—about the significance of the fact that at 10 o'clock troops were withdrawn from Moscow. All I should like to say is: How could they be withdrawn if they had not been brought in in the first place? I can state in all responsibility that no additional troops have been brought into Moscow over recent days—neither Ministry of Internal Affairs troops nor Soviet Army troops. When I spoke yesterday I reported

that there had been brought into play a large number of militia staff, of Internal Affairs Ministry troops, and of Soviet Army personnel; but all of these were only those units which are permanently stationed here. It has been said that military hardware has been removed. Comrades, I should once again like to say that there was no military hardware yesterday.

Some deputies even today continued to claim at the Russian Congress that there were BTR's [armored personnel carriers] that they saw with their own eyes, that they had to pass under their gun barrels. There was not a single BTR on the streets of Moscow at that time.

As to the military equipment, to call the trucks the servicemen—specifically those from the Dzerzhinskiy division, that is, the internal troops were brought in—to call them military equipment, well, I think this is a rather far-fetched way of calling them.

Forty-nine poepple spoke at the meetings. Among them, 44 people's deputies of various levels—Afanasyev, Popov, Travkin, Kalugin, Starovoytova, Chernichenko, Murashov, Yakunin, (Urashtsev), and so on. Their utterances and statements amounted to attacks on the USSR president, the CPSU, the coutnry's leadership, critizism of the political course, of the decisions adopted; and also to an all- round support of the line of the chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet and the introduction of an RSFSR presidency. Many speeches were supported by those gathered souting anticommunist and antigovernment slogans. There were posters and banners of similar contents.

In spite of the measures taken by the organizers of the meeting and their attempts, from the platforms, to restrain people from unpredictable actions, the situation was often simply on the verge of getting out of control. In a number of places, repeated calls and attempts at provoking violations of law and order could be observed. This included—and this was registered here in Moscow for the first time—using broadcasts for this purpose. Also, multiple instances of blocking the city transport routes, breaking cordons and barriers, disobedience to the militia personnel and insults against them. There were cases of crime. Thus in Tratralnaya Square, at 1900, for hooligan actions in the crowd a ninth level student was detained; a self-made pistol with cartridges was confiscated from him. Well, you can imagine what could happen just because of this one teenager, what the consequences could be. Certain violaitons of the law happened with an obvious connivance, and even with the participation of people's deputies, which is particularly distressing. At the Vozdvizhenka metyro station, Deputy (Barykin) of Moscow City Soviet was calling upon the citizens to put up resistance to militiamen and servicemen. He was overturning barriers and did not react to warnings. He uttered threats and insults addressed at the personnel.

The most difficult situation on Tverskaya Street, in the region of Pushkin square, the central department store, and the House of Soviets. Those who had gathered—for the most part young people from Zelinograd and Tushino—would not disperse for a long time. Among them were very many people who were under the influence of alcohol or drugs. This group numbered something in the region of 500-600 people, and they behaved in a most aggressive way. They uttered threats, threw stones, and tried to overturn cars. There were provocative shouts and, in particular, when someone in the crowd shouted out "Tanks", a mass of people rushed toward the entrance area of the metro station. Many of them were crushed against the cordon. This is what this sort of provocation can mean when such a large number of people gather together, particularly when they are, of course, in such a difficult and excitable condition.

In order to prevent these violations of public order, militiamen using riot shields dispersed the group of young people. In talking of this, I cannot fail to mention the difficulties of carrying out this duty and the restraint and discipline of the militia personnel, the internal forces, and the Soviet Army, who bore a great moral and physical burden.

We consider that the discussions held by the USSR vice president, the actions of the leadership and deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and yesterday's appeal to the capital's residents played an important role in guaranteeing law and order. All of this, to a certain degree, had an effect on the organizers of these events by increasing their responsibility. But the efforts to guarantee order undertaken by the organizers of these events were, comrade deputies, very noticeably just for show.

Special groups were set up for the first time for these purposes—at least, they were registered for the first time—of men of an athletic build wearing white armbands marked D.R. and calling themselves the reserve, or guard. For the most part, their main task was the defense of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] people's deputies and the leaders of the Democratic Russia bloc.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that, on the whole, the action in Moscow did not receive support in the RSFSR and in the country. Meetings with a similar aim took place in only six towns: Voronezh, Novgorod, Cheboksary, and another three towns. At most, 1,200 people participated in them. This means something in the region of 150-200 or 300 people in each town.

The USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs is continuing to implement measures to guarantee law and order and security in Moscow. Particular attention is being devoted to control of the situation which still remains complex, to put it bluntly. The USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, in matters of guaranteeing law and order in Moscow, will be strictly governed by the statements of the USSR Supreme Soviet made on 28 March, the statement you made yesterday.

I would express the hope that all organizations and parties, during this difficult time for the country, will show wisdom and restraint and will aim for consolidation.

Supreme Soviet

Deputies Discuss Rally, Draft Enterprise Law

PM0104102391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by legislative correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev: "USSR Supreme Soviet on Moscow Demonstrations"]

[Excerpts] The 29 March joint sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet was unplanned. It was logical that the country's parliament should react immediately to the previous day's events, irrespective of how they might have developed. But now the results of the Moscow rallies are known. USSR Minister of Internal Affairs B. Pugo provided deputies with a report on them and the situation in the capital. [passage omitted]

In the course of a brief discussion the view was repeatedly expressed that on 28 March the country's legislature displayed wisdom, courage, staunchness, and also the ability to adopt sensible decisions. It proved possible to ascertain that the "thugs" mentioned at the previous sitting were the "Democratic Russia" movement activists who the rally organizers had entrusted with ensuring security while it was being held. They were distinguished by white armbands carrying the letters "DR." A. Lukyanov also informed deputies that his statement the previous day about G. Popov leaving Moscow was made as a result of inaccurate information obtained from the Moscow City Soviet. As for deputy A. Sobchak's statement about sub-machine gunners in the center of the capital, it was checked out, including by A. Sobchak himself, and not confirmed. The participants in the sitting adopted a resolution noting the positive work of militia staffers, internal troopers, and Soviet Army servicemen in safeguarding order and security in the capital.

The deputies then returned to discussing the law on the general principles of enterprise in the USSR which had been adopted in toto the previous day. An article-by-article discussion of the draft law began.

As during the debates on a number of questions the previous day, fundamental differences flared up again. They became particularly acute during the discussion of the article in the draft law on legalizing hired labor in our country. Chairman A. Lukyanov was forced to declare a recess to allow passions to cool.

After the recess A. Lukyanov reported that he had had meetings with groups of deputies, and particularly with a group of worker deputies. He had concluded from these conversations that the controversial article required more profound and serious discussion, and the sitting barely had a quorum. The chairman proposed that the debate on the draft law be resumed at the next joint sitting. The proposal was supported.

The next joint sitting of the fifth USSR Supreme Soviet session will take place 1 April.

International Committee on Ties With Japan

PM0104092391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Mar 91 Union Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Session Held"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee held a (closed) session 27 March to discuss the state of and prospects for Soviet-Japanese relations. The session was addressed by Soviet Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh.

The USSR people's deputies who are committee members and took part in the discussion pointed to the importance of President M.S. Gorbachev's forthcoming visit for the future of Soviet-Japanese relations, stressing the importance of safeguarding the USSR's national interests, of firm good-neighborly relations with Japan, and of their further constructive development, not least in the interests of international stability and security.

Supreme Soviet Discussion on Demonstration

PM3103122991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[M. Buzhkevich and N. Musiyenko report under "Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow" rubric: "Under the Pressure of Events"]

[Excerpts] Opening yesterday's USSR Supreme Soviet session, which he chaired, A. Lukyanov announced that the extraordinary Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies had begun, and proposed that the country's parliament sent it wishes for success and fruitful work in the spirit of constructiveness and the interests of the peoples of Russia, and of all Soviet people. Somewhat later an appeal to the congress was adopted expressing such wishes. [passage omitted].

Deputy F. Burlatskiy and several other parliamentarians proposed that representatives of the government and Moscow Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] meet each other again immediately in order to search for a mutually acceptable way out of the crisis situation. The session instructed Soviet of the Union Chairman I. Laptev to inform the country's leaders of this proposal. In his absence debates continued on the enterprise bill.

On his return I. Laptev reported that he had talked with Vice President G. Yanayev, Prime Minister V. Pavlov, and his first deputy, V. Doguzhiyev. They had assured him that all attempts would be made to eliminate conflict. But even after his report debates about the rally did not end. Some insisted that the ban on the rally be lifted. Others objected to them, believing that that it was necessary to seek for the rally itself to be called off, since to hold it could lead to the escalation of further political

tension, not only in the capital, but throughout the country. The chairman interrupted them, announcing a one-hour break. In his words, by that time the session would receive full information about the state of affairs.

After lunch A. Lukyanov informed the deputies that he had just talked with the USSR president and vice president, the chairman of the USSR KGB, and the USSR minister of internal affairs. He had not managed to talk with Moscow City Soviet Chairman G. Popov since the latter had gone to Gelendzhik. R. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, also met the USSR president, and was firmly told that the Union Cabinet of Ministers' decision to ban the rally was not liable to be repealed.

The session discussed alternative versions of a Supreme Soviet resolution on the prevailing situation in the capital. They were both rejected. While the working group prepared a new version, deputies managed to finish discussion of the Law on the General Principles of Enterprise by Citizens in the USSR, and adopted it in its entirety. Then deputies ratified the text of a USSR Supreme Soviet statement addressed to the inhabitants of Moscow.

At the end of the working day the session ratified the new personnel of parliamentary committees and commissions.

Further Debate on Moscow Rally Ban

PM2903162691 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Mar 91 Union Edition pp 1-2

[Report by legislative correspondents A. Stepovoy, S. Chugayev from the Kremlin: "USSR Supreme Soviet: No Change in the Position on the Rally"]

[Excerpt] The morning's joint sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Fifth Session began with a proposal from the chairman to send greetings on behalf of the USSR legislature to the extraordinary Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies. A. Lukyanov proposed that the congress participants be sent wishes for their work to proceed in a constructive spirit, so that all forces are rallied with a view to improving people's lives.

The chairman then proposed that the participants in the sitting move on to consider, at its second reading, a legislative act that is, it was stressed, pivotal and necessary to active progress toward a market economy—the draft law "On the General Principles of Citizens' Entrepreneurship in the USSR." However, the peaceful process of lawmaking work that was about to begin was disrupted by Deputy V. Yudin. The deputy drew his colleagues' attention to the fact that a major event was planned for that day of the session's work in Moscow. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers decision to ban the rally planned for the capital, a decision not supported by Moscow City Soviet, is creating an explosive situation and putting the participants in the rally and also those who are instructed to prevent this action in the position of hostages. V. Yudin proposed that the participants in the sitting summon to the USSR Supreme Soviet representatives of the leadership of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and Moscow Gorispolkom [City Soviet Executive Committee], hear them out, and adopt a decision that could prevent the probable grave consequences of such a confrontation. As one possible solution, it was proposed to lift the ban on the rally, since Moscow City Soviet has taken upon itself the full responsibility for ensuring order and security. However, when it was put to the vote this proposal did not receive the support of the majority of deputies.

After that, Deputy A. Sobchak requested the floor. On behalf of the legislative faction of the Interregional Deputies' Group, he read out a statement saying that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution on the temporary suspension of the holding of rallies and demonstrations in Moscow and the USSR president's decree on creating a USSR MVD Main Administration for Moscow and Moscow Oblast are contrary to the USSR Constitution and existing legislation. Legislation, in particular, makes provision for such a ban only in the conditions of a state of emergency. In view of the fact that in 1990-1991 Moscow City Soviet has ensured security during rallies involving many thousands of people in Moscow, the statement says, and also the fact that the planned rally is to take place, in effect, in nonworking time, in accordance with the USSR Supreme Soviet appeal, the order to MVD organs to prevent the rally from being held by using barriers and tear gas is unlawful and basically provocative.

If hundreds of thousands of people participate in the rally, the fulfillment of this order, in the view of the authors of the statement, will inevitably lead to clashes and casualties on an unprecedented scale. Now, a few hours before these possibly tragic events, the statement says, the USSR Supreme Soviet has the opportunity and the duty to stop the dangerous development of events. The statement's authors ask the Supreme Soviet, in accordance with the appeal of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Moscow City Soviet Presidium, immediately to repeal the Cabinet of Ministers resolution as unconstitutional, and to suspend the operation of the USSR president's 26 March decree pending a ruling by the Constitutional Oversight Committee.

This statement caused rather a stormy reaction in the legislature. The deputy who read it was asked a number of questions. Among them was a question from Deputy S. Umalatova: Why is it that, when she put forward a proposal at the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies that the USSR president should resign (and the deputy stressed that she still holds this opinion), A. Sobchak actively opposed it, yet today he is supporting an action aimed in effect at removing the legitimately elected authorities? S. Umalatova also expressed the view that the purpose of the rally is to enable its organizers to come to power, but they will not succeed in this.

Answering this question, Deputy A. Sobchak said that accusations that certain people are power-hungry are totally unfounded. If anyone is trying to regain power today, in the deputy's view, it is the Communist structures that were removed from power. As regards his own position on the question of the USSR president's resignation, A. Sobchak noted that he has never demanded his resignation and does not support this call today. Furthermore A. Sobchak stressed that in his view all questions connected with the president's resignation or a change of course by the government should be decided by legitimate legislative means. As for the holding of the rally and the question of whether its aims are in the people's interest, the speaker expressed the view that when hundreds of thousands of people take to the streets, they are the people too. And these people, A. Sobchak believes, want one thing—to leave behind the totalitarian Communist regime and achieve a free democratic society.

In the course of the ensuing debates the majority of deputies agreed that the Cabinet of Ministers resolution is not in accordance with legislation, but at the same time the view expressed by Deputy V. Opolinskiy was heard repeatedly: Everything that is done for the people's sake, but unlawfully, must be made lawful. Furthermore many speakers pinned the responsibility for the possible consequences on the rally's organizers.

Half an hour after the start of the debates, the chairman drew the would-be contributors' attention to the auditorium's will—to end the debate and move on to work on the draft law. As for the situation in Moscow, the relevant instruction of the legislature to the Cabinet of Ministers remains in force and the government of the country is responsible for ensuring order and security in the capital. A. Lukyanov also announced that the Interregional Deputies Group statement would be conveyed immediately to the USSR president and prime minister.

After that, the deputies began to examine at its second reading the draft law on the general principles of citizens' entrepreneurship in the USSR. Deputy N. Bobritskiy delivered a report on the results of work on the draft law.

Before the first recess the Supreme Soviet adopted an appeal to the Third Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies.

Immediately after the recess a statement by Deputies Ye. Velikhov, A. Veprev, and F. Burlatskiy was read out, containing a proposal that in connection with the planned rally the Cabinet of Ministers be instructed to organize an immediate meeting with the Moscow Gorispolkom leaders. Commenting on this statement, A. Lukyanov noted that such meetings have been held before, including a meeting between the rally organizers and the USSR vice president. The results are well known. Nonetheless contacts are continuing. A. Lukyanov also expressed perplexity at the predictions of bloodshed at the rally. Concerning the decision adopted by the RSFSR Congress on the withdrawal of troops from the center of Moscow, A. Lukyanov expressed doubt as to its legality or constitutionality.

A. Lukyanov also proposed that I. Laptev, chairman of the Soviet of the Union, immediately contact the USSR president and prime minister with a view to briefing the country's parliament on the latest events in the capital. [passage omitted]

Heated Debate at 28 Mar Session

PM3103145191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 91 Union Edition pp 1-3

[Report by legislative correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev: "USSR Supreme Soviet: Appeal To Refrain From Demonstrations"]

[Excerpts] The 28 March joint session of the Supreme Soviet chambers turned out to be nervous and tense. Several times deputies started discussing the draft law on the general principles of enterprise in the USSR, but they would suddenly be interrupted by another speech by a speaker who had obtained further information about the upcoming rally...

We broke off our previous report at the point where A. Lukyanov had requested Soviet of the Union Chairman I. Laptev to immediately contact the president, the vice president, and the prime minister in order to inform the Union parliament about the latest events in the capital.

After this the deputies returned to examining the draft law. [passage omitted]

A. Lukyanov broke off the debate and gave the floor to I. Laptev, who had just appeared in the chamber.

The Soviet of the Union chairman reported that he had had a conversation with Yanayev, Pavlov, and Doguzhiyev, who had participated in the talks with the Moscow Gorispolkom [City Soviet Executive Committee] leaders. The resolution adopted by the Union parliament had used the words: "It is proposed that the Moscow City Soviet..." The Moscow Gorispolkom leaders regarded this wording as purely recommendatory and nonbinding on them. They decided to stick with the resolution adopted by the Moscow City Soviet Presidium, that authorized this rally and insisted that it be held.

The situation is indeed complex, I. Laptev admitted. All the comrades assured me that attempts to seek the necessary compromise solutions are continuing. At the same time any attempts to interfere in this process at this time will not yield anything positive. I came to the conclusion, I. Laptev said, that the appropriate officials are engaged on this matter and that any judgment or resolution we might now make will change little, unfortunately. Will they find a compromise? he asked, and made a completely unexpected but understandable attempt to answer it himself: Let us pray that they will.

But these words did not calm things down. Deputy V. Martirosyan proposed that a decision be adopted citing the inadmissibility of the use of force. His fellow deputy and colleague from the Army corps, V. Alksnis, spoke resolutely and belligerently. He stated: If we meet the demands and give way to the demonstrators today you might as well let them into the Kremlin, because in a month or a week there would be demonstrators standing in Ivan Square and a week after that they would be sitting here in this hall, on that balcony over there. Something of the kind has already happened in the GDR, Lithuanian, Moldova. And he concluded: Ours will be the same epilogue....

Marshal of the Soviet Union deputy S. Akhromeyev, aide to the USSR president, was in no less resolute a mood than Colonel V. Alksnis that day.

The discussion of the pre-rally situation lasted until the end of the morning session. [passage omitted]

The deputies devoted the time remaining to the solution of internal problems. Supreme Soviet resolutions were adopted on the election of new legislative committees—the USSR Supreme Soviet Legislation and Law and Order Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Industry and Power Generation Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet All-Union Consumer Market Committee, and the USSR Supreme Soviet Transport, Communications, and Information Technology Committee. A completely new committee—the USSR Supreme Soviet Culture Committee—was also elected. Deputy V. Stelmashonok, chairman of the Belorussian Artists' Union Board, was elected head of this committee by an absolute majority.

You would have thought that even fewer questions would have arisen during the discussion of the renewal of already existing committees. But in a complete surprise to many people, and evidently by pure coincidence, academician deputies came under attack. When the debate turned to the Economic Reform Committee, Deputy V. Tikhonov proposed that deputies O. Bogomolov and P. Bunich be excluded from the committee. Because they rarely attend sessions. But arguments such as the priority of quality of work over frequency of attendance proved more persuasive, and as a result of a vote the two academicians stayed on the committee. The case of the Science and Technologies Committee was trickier. First, more than half the members of the committee were being replaced, and its name was also being changed slightly. This gave some deputies a pretext for raising the question of electing the complete committee. The main reason, it transpired, was reports in the press that Committee Chairman Yu. Ryzhov has joined the Consultative and Coordinating Council Under the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Soviet Republic] Supreme Soviet Chairman. In the view of Deputies Ye. Kim, A. Krayko, and a group of deputies who put their indecipherable signatures to a note addressed to the session presidium, this combining of jobs (Yu. Ryzhov explained that his work in the Russian Supreme is unpaid) is bound to prevent Yu. Ryzhov from fully devoting himself to committee affairs. A. Krayko also stressed Yu. Ryzhov's inclination to participate in political actions. In this connection deputies raised the question of replacing the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Science and Technologies Committee.

Far from all the session participants approved of this turn of events. It was mentioned that many deputies combine work in the USSR Supreme Soviet with activity in social organizations.

Before going on to discuss the chairman's fate, the session participants had to confirm new committee members. Typically, none of the candidates proposed by the committee—deputies I. Shamshev, S. Sulakshin, and V. Lopatin—won the support of the legislature. We observe that similar proposals from other committees have been adopted without any obstacles. It was possibly this that gave Deputy P. Osipov grounds for remarking that what was happening reminded him not of rotation but of obstruction of deputies because of their political views.

Passions which had been on the point of abating were ready to flare up again, and A. Lukyanov, who could obviously sense this, proposed that the question of the chairmanship of the Science and Technologies Committee be discussed at the next sitting.

By contrast, the election of the new chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Women's and Family Affairs and Demographic Policy Committee took place amid complete unanimity. Deputy M. Rakhmanova was elected to the post. With this peaceful episode 28 March—a working day of rare nervous tension during the fifth session of the country's legislature—came to a close.

Political & Social

Yazov Answers Viewers' Questions

LD3103202191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1215 GMT 30 Mar 91

["Who's Who" program with Dmitriy Yazov, USSR defense minister and marshal of the Soviet Union; hosted by Igor Fesunenko—live]

[Text] [Fesunenko] Hello, esteemed comrade viewers. "Who's Who" is on the air again. As you know, this program acquaints you with eminent state personalities, politicians, and public figures in our country. Vice President Yanayev, Prime Minister Pavlov, KGB Chairman Kryuchkov, academician Shatalin, Nikolay Gubenko, Aleksandr, Dzasokhov, Ruslan Khasbulatov, and many other eminent political personalities and citizens of our country have already been interviewed in the "Who's Who" studio. Our guest today is Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, USSR minister of defense and marshal of the Soviet Union.

I remind you that this program is going out live. Our telephone number is on the screen now—217-4543.

There are 12 lines. I have already been told that our 12 typists have already begun to take down your questions. So if you have a question for Marshal Yazov, call us on 217-4543.

As it happens, over 3,500 letters have already been received from you, comrade viewers, since we announced a month ago that the next guest of this program would be Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov. You can imagine what a pile that makes. Of course you appreciate perfectly well that not all these letters can be quoted or even mentioned on the program. I can definitely assure you of one thing, however. Each one of these letters will be forwarded to the Ministry of Defense and will be studied there by the minister's assistants and secretariat and, maybe, by the minister himself. I guarantee you that. We have tried to select the most typical and representative of these letters, the ones which most fully and objectively reflect the prevailing trends, so to speak. We have picked out the most typical and interesting questions and they will be used on this program.

Before commencing, I would like to hand you a letter, Dmitriy Timofeyevich, without quoting it. This is a letter from a group of 70 people who once served in the Army with you. They are all reserve officers and retired officers living in Latvia. The Baltic republics are a hot spot for the Army and for all of us. I consider it my duty to hand over this letter. There is a whole series of questions contained in it. It is signed by 70 former officers. We won't reply to them now. On behalf of the program, however, I merely ask you to accept it and give it your special attention. They are comrades who, I repeat, are now on the reserve or retired. In view of hte fact that Latvia may withdraw from the Soviet Union, I simply ask you to study their needs and problems. This is not—this is a complex question. We won't talk about it now, but I ask you to give it your attention later.

[Yazov] Yes, yes, yes.

[Fesunenko] In just the same way that the Baltic republics, naturally, have the right to withdraw from the Soviet Union, our Russian citizens living there, in particular reserve officers, are fully entitled to respect and attention both from the local authorities and from the center. If there is anyone who deserves special attention, in my opinion it is people like these. It is the accepted thing to say that now.

Now that I have made these short introductory remarks, permit me to begin the program. We are going to begin it with our first video clip, a short video clip which was filmed by "Who's Who" cameramen. Let's have it how please.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent Pribylov] The man with a gun does not have the most popular role today: on the left he is cursed by people holding rallies; on the right the Stalinists are whispering in his ear. He is obliged, however, to stand at attention at his post, protecting with his body not the person of the president, or the chairman, but simply the motherland, all of us. All those who once pushed him towards the Lena gold mines, or to the Winter Palace. What's the difference? Perhaps they were continuing politics by other means. Such cruel games today are more than a crime; our troops are not tin soldiers, and what they have had in their hands has not been a rifle for a long, long time. [video shows previously carried footage, identified as nuclear command post, leading on to shot of underwater nuclear test. Film then cuts to show what is apparently Yazov's office, with maps, newspapers, and photos, then shows Yazov speaking to correspondent Stanislav Pribylov]

The huge military machine today works under the leadership of a 66-year-old marshal, born in Yazovo, Omsk Oblast. On the map in the minister's office the whole world is laid out to view: it is his work to guard it. Poetry and books in his free time, if he has any. The photo album of the minister's career earns respect. A childhood in a poor, large family. College, the front, the whole of the Soviet Union from Moscow to Kamchatka, and Cuba in the Caribbean crisis. The service career of the 13th Soviet commander in chief does not end on Arbat Square. Dmitriy Yazov is included in a new formaiton of the sixth year of perestroyka, the country's Security Council.

[Yazov] When people talk about our public and state system, I will say frankly that not only could you not dream, but it would be quite unimaginable, I think, that the son of an illiterate collective farm woman should become a minister, marshal, and so on.

[Pribylov] How interesting life can be. Five years have passed, and we are meeting again, although you will hardly remember me. I was a soldier, and you were on exercises in Amur Oblast. That was five years ago. At that time you were the commander of the Far East okrug. Now when I recall my military service I recall most of all the Far Easterners, the civilians. How about you?

[Yazov] You know, when I dig into my recollections, it is always the most painful, the most difficult times, the most difficult episodes that come into my memory, and as a rule I mostly recall the ordinary soldiers.

[Pribylov] For any military man, the main book, the main law, is the regulations. The regulations say that all troops must address each other using the formal mode of address, irrespective of their posts or their ranks. Tell me ... [changes thought] Well, it's true, sometimes personal relations come to the fore, and sometimes people address each other in other ways. You yourself, what do you prefer?

[Yazov] You know, it is probably just somehow in my blood, as a rule I use the formal address to ordinary soldiers—but for officers, the heads of staff, and their deputies, usually the informal address. Somehow it seems to me to be more intimate.

[Pribylov] Now, the expression military duty. It contains the word duty. That's to say, the military man owes a duty. Tell me, what does the Soviet soldier owe anyone today?

[Yazov] You know, it is taken from the oath and is the main thing contained in the regulations; namely, that duty is owed. I consider that the serviceman owes a duty to his people. For what purpose is the army set up and who sets it up? Many people think that the army is created by the state, but nothing of the kind. The army is created by the people.

[Pribylov] Earlier, before the revolution, Russian servicemen served under the slogan "For the tsar and for the fatherland!", but now the notion of fatherland is, you will agree, different for, say, Lithuanians and Russians. The question of our tsar is also a contentious one. Tell us under what slogan Soviet officers would now go to war, if they had to.

[Yazov] I should like nevertheless to say a few words about the tsar. After Charles XII [of Sweden] was wounded near Lesnaya, when the troops had already been drawn up in the fields outside Poltava, he was borne on a stretcher in front of their formation and he called on the servicemen to fight for Charles XII. Peter I [the Great] acted otherwise. When he learned that Charles was being carried on a stretcher and making appeals, he went around all his troops on horseback and said: Soldiers, you must not think that you are fighting for people and for your fatherland. Know this about Peter, that his life is not dear to him. He only wishes for Russia to live in glory and prosperity".

Therefore, when the talk is about the tsar, it is necessary to understand whether or not the tsar represents his people.

[Pribylov] There is even a whole theory according to which a person is influenced by what he sees out of the window, because sometimes when a person is thinking he goes to the window. Tell us what you think about when you look out of the window.

[Yazov] Well, my windows indeed overlook the courtyard, but I agree with your question. When you sit in your office, no one reports anything bad to you and you think that everything is all right, you can at times paint yourself a bright and cheerful picture, and then when you go somewhere and see disorders you start to think that you are sitting in your office to no good purpose and that you need to visit the troops more frequently, and not listen only to what is being reported to you. After all, everyone doing the reporting wants as a rule to show that everything is a little better than it really is.

[Pribylov] What do you think now is the most suitable age for a senior officer?

[Yazov] You obviously have in mind, so to speak, the fact that the minister is already getting on and my age. In our country the sevice of the senior officers is as follows: lieutenant colonels serve until the age of 45 years, but, if, say, a 45-year-old lieutenant colonel has defended his doctoral dissertation and works at an academy or college, it would be a shame to retire him. Obviously he needs to be given greater opportunities to develop. The minister is empowered by law to extend that officer's service to, say, 50 years of age, to 55 years of age.

[Pribylov] Some generals who have academic decrees are allowed to stay on in service until the age of 60. There are, in fact, some medical officers, for instance, ones who specialize in unusual areas, doctors of science, for example, whom we retain for as long as they are still capable of working or we keep them on as consultants. As far as the minister is concerned, everything depends on his work capability. [end recording]

[Fesunenko] When we were preparing this program, Dmitriy Timofeyevich, I and my colleagues belonging to the "Who's Who" camera team were able to visit several units of our Armed Forces, for which I would like to thank you, in particular. Thank you very much. I think this helped us. We will use this material during the program. I was reminded of my own service in the Army. I also gave the motherland the regulation two-and-a-half years' service. But that was 35 years ago. So long ago that I no longer even remember exactly how many years ago it was. It now seems that the army is completely changed. That's the impression I get. The things I saw on our visit to the missile troops and motorized infantry gave me the impression that the Army has changed completely over 35 years. That is, perhaps, the question I'd like to begin with what is the Army like now, how has it changed from the Army of 30 years ago, say, the army of my youth? The Army is now the focus of attention, of public attention. A lot is being said about the Army and the country, the Army and society. The Army is being criticized and the Army is being defended. No doubt these questions were also discussed at the all-Army party conference which has just ended. Here I ought to inform viewers that the minister came to the studio straight from the all-Army party conference, if I'm not mistaken. So, could you please say a few words about what the Army is like today, about what worries you most at the moment. We'll begin with that. Over to you.

[Yazov] Thank you. If you have no objection, I would first like to greet the esteemed viewers, especially war veterans and mothers of soldiers, sergeants and officers who are currently serving in the Army, to wish them the best of health and good fortune. Yes indeed, the party conference just ended today. The first party committee in the Armed Forces has been elected. This is, in fact, what now distinguishes party organs in the Armed Forces from those organs which existed until the establishment of the military-political organs, when political organs and party organs were the same thing. The military-political organs will now be a branch, so to speak, of the chain of command, while the party organs will be organs elected by the party organizations. They will now lead a separate existence, so to speak. Obviously

the relations of party organs, the relations of commanders with secretaries of party committees, will still go on grinding themselves in to a certain extent. The Army on the whole will continue to be based on a combined system of command. I think any commander who belongs to this combined system should stand to benefit from the fact that he receives the assistance of communists. Therefore, he must rely on party organizations.

There was a general discussion of this. There was a discussion about things which should now concern us. The communists held critical, serious and exacting discussions. I ought to mention that there was none of that frivolous eulogization or disdain, so to speak, for the problems and shortcomings which face us today. The comrades spoke in quite an exacting way about the entire situation and, let me tell you straight, there was criticism not just of the defense minister but of the party Central Committee and the government, especially on questions affecting the social, economic and other circumstances which soldiers face in our society.

[Fesunenko] Thank you. We will say a great deal more about this during today's program, which will last 90 minutes. I remind you, comrade viewers, that this program is going out live. Your questions are being answered by Marshal Yazov, the defense minister. Out telephone number is 2174543. Please let us have your questions. We still have 75 minutes left.

Now, I would like to ask the following question on behalf of viewers and on my own behalf. There now remain slightly less than three months to 22 June, when we will be marking a black date in the history of our country, the 50th anniversary of fascist Germany's attack on the Soviet Union. Such dates always force us to ponder the past and consider the future. Why, one asks, do we sometimes fail to show proper respect toward those who gave their lives for the motherland? Why are there still so many dead servicemen who have not even been given a decent burial, whose bones are still scattered over former battlefields? Is the Defense Ministry concerned about this? Is it taking any measures?

[Yazov] Igor Sergeyevich, the Ministry of Defense is of course concerned about this. I would like to say that during the Great Patriotic War—and I was a commander of a platoon and commander of a regiment at the front—I never saw such a thing as the dead not being buried.

It is a different matter that there were many communal burial grounds scattered over a wide area, but at the same time many formations and units found themselves surrounded, in swamps, and of course they died somewhere, but there is no land here that doesn't have an owner. Land belongs to the republics, the krays, the oblasts, the rayons, the soviets. I think the local authorities could concern themselves a little with it.

As for the armed forces, we shall take all possible measures once again to traverse the former frontline country, from the Srednyy Peninsula and ending with the Dzhebushkalskiy positions in the Crimea, and do everything possible to amalgamate some communal burial grounds, set up monuments, and so on.

[Fesunenko] That's a good task for the new political bodies which are now being set up.

[Yazov] Quite right. But I wanted to say that we are now working on a book of memory. We intend to make a book of memory for the 50th anniversary of the victory in the Great Patriotic War, such that all the names of the conscripts who were killed or who did not return from the war should be inscribed in this book. This will be a monument and a reminder to all people who are living and thriving.

This is very important. But at the same I want to say that the veterans who are thriving must also not be forgotten.

[Fesunenko] Excuse me, Nelli Osipovna Pechora of Adler writes about that, so does Dmitriy Vasilyevich Kaprich, Hero of the Soviet Union, of Moscow, who has problems; Nikolay Andreyevich Kulishov of Magnitogorsk asks when there will be benefits for children whose fathers were killed at the front. Indeed, there are a great deal of letters about the fate of war veterans. Of course one would like to hear that the ministry is not indifferent to this.

[Yazov] You know, we have done and are doing a lot of work on this. Virtually all the veterans of the Great Patriotic War have now all got pensions. Actually, some get social provision and a pension from the local bodies, but a large proportion of war veterans get a pension from the Ministry of Defense.

[Fesunenko] Here is a curious thing. I have in my hands a file sent by a person who fought in the Great Patriotic War. His name is Vladimir Terentyevich Kuts. But paradoxical as it may seem, he is not considered a war veteran. I'll ask the camera to show this document. It is a certificate proving that he fought in the 4th Infantry Division in the United States. It is in English, signed officially by Harry Grampham, commander—no, president of the veterans of that division. And this adolescent of ours was seized during the Great Patriotic War and taken away to Germany by the Germans. Then at the end of the war, when the Americans had liberated the area where he was, he found himself first liberated by the Americans, then he joined the U.S. Army 4th Infantry Division and fought. Then, after the Soviet and U.S. Armies had met up, he transferred to us, naturally pining for his country, but actually what is interesting is that for a long time he was actually forbidden by the security bodies to mention the fact that he had fought with the Americans. Just recently the Americans themselves sought him out, gave him a certificate that he was a veteran of World War II, and here he somehow isn't considered a veteran of the Great Patriotic War.

[Yazov] Igor Sergeyevich, I am familiar with Vladimir Terentyevich's letter. What happened to him is indeed

unusual. He fought with the 4th Division of the First U.S. Army, and he did a lot to help capture a fortified region which he pointed out to the Americans. He, as an adolescent. We didn't have a law saying that men, or soldiers, or citizens, who fought in other armies should be considered participants in the Great Patriotic War.

[Fesunenko] Is that really fair?

[Yazov] I consider that it isn't fair. You have to find out how much he fought. I know from his letter that when the war was coming to an end, and they met on the Oder, he was released by the Americans and handed over to the 5th Airborne Assault Division of Soviet troops. By that time the war had ended.

[Fesunenko] But he fought there?

[Yazov] Yes, but from May to August he was with the 5th Airborne Assault Division of Soviet troops. I think we will work this out with him specifically, and I think we will decide on it favorably. This is a unique case.

[Fesunenko] It seems unique, and that's the nub of it. Thank you. Now I should like to ask our producer, Svetlana Maslyukova, to show another clip which I ask you to look at attentively. This clip will contain the point of my next question. Go ahead, Svetlana. [Video shows firing ground, troops, Yazov speaking to troops]

On 25 March, the minister of defense invited our film group to Leningrad, to the 270th Training Motorized Rifle Regiment, where he himself served as an officer some time ago now. Dmitriy Timofeyevich visited the rifle range, chatted with the men and the officers, gave advice, expressed his wishes and made reproaches for sloppiness. Some soldiers, it turned out, did not know the exact norms of their allowance. That is not right, it must be corrected.

[Yazov, to soldier] Thirty grams of meat, 100 grams of fish, 30 grams of butter, 30 grams of fat; 820 grammes of vegetables, 550 grammes of potatoes. How can this be, division commander?

[Fesunenko] In the unit club the marshal was welcomed by veterans from his regiment. He fought with some in the Great Patriotic War, with others he served in Leningrad, in Central Asia, in the Far East, and even in Cuba in the 1960s. The warriors recalled past days, as they say. And the Marshal also recalled the past, shared his opinions about today, and the tasks set to the Army by life. He answered questions; for example, how he spends his free time.

[Yazov] Well, some people evidently think the higher a boss is in rank, he really does have more free time. A minister doesn't have any free time at all. Here are the comrades accompanying me: They can confirm it. I sleep in one room, and they are on duty in the room next door.

You know, what is the responsibility of a minister, if, for example, we let through some strike? All communications, even if I am in my bedroom, they still all come to me. Everything also goes to the general secretary. Everything also goes to those persons on whom the adoption of a decision for a counterstrike depends.

[Fesunenko] In that connection, I want to ask a question. Naturally, as minister of defense you are the most senior person in the Army, responsible for the security of our country. Yet the commander in chief of the Armed Forces is the president. Everyone knows this. But in this connection I want to ask: Of course we now consider that the possibility of an unexpected nuclear war has been reduced to an infinitesimally small degree, but there are things that can happen, an unexpected launch, an accidential launch—we can't answer for the Americans, theoretically speaking, or for anything else. Suppose you see that missiles are on their way. I know that you always have your communications with you, and that even now you are capable of getting onto the telephone immediately and communicating with the relevant stations. Quite right. There is a person standing right by with a telephone, even here in the studio.

[Yazov] Yes.

[Fesunenko] When we were flying to Leningrad with you, there were communications in the plane. When we were driving, there were communicaitons in the car. I want to ask you again to imagine: You get a signal that a missile has been launched toward us from somewhere. What do you do?

[Yazov] Well, you know Igor Sergeyevich, there is a certain system which is a state secret.

[Fesunenko] The bits that are not secret. Can you tell us?

[Yazov] Yes, what isn't secret. Contact has to be made, a decision made at the level whose duty it is; then, knowing the relevant codes to dial them, put them together, and then give the signal. This is a very responsible thing, and not a simple one.

[Fesunenko] I can imagine. But anyway it is not you who makes the decision by yourself about the start of war.

[Yazov] No, there is no one person who makes the decision by himself.

[Fesunenko] I see.

[Yazov] A nuclear strike, in response or not, is a very responsible thing, for that reason, we have just as responsible an attitude to the whole system of antimissile defense.

[Fesunenko] I asked the question because some people sometimes have the idea, or go to extremes: Either they say we don't need nuclear weapons, or they say we are wrong to cut them. And at the same time there are fears lest war break out—a nuclear one—because of some negligence or some chance happening. From our side, at least, you can guarantee that there cannot be any chance launch?

[Yazov] Igor Sergeyevich, if you have noticed, Mikhail Sergeyevich has spoken many times about the necessity of cutting nuclear weapons.

[Fesunenko] Absolutely true.

[Yazov] We have already completed the ilimination of medium- and short-range missiles. Now we are completing, we are close to signing a treaty on a 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons.

[Fesunenko] It won't be 50 percent, but a little bit less; but we'll hope that it will come.

[Yazov] There might even be a little more.

[Fesunenko] We'll see.

[Yazov] Yes. It all depends how much each has got. A ceiling has been set of 6,000 items of nuclear ammunition, a certain number of carriers and the distribution by type of armed force.

But I want to say that as long as nuclear weapons exist in the world, we must be on our combat guard and implement a ceaseless monitoring of possible missile launches. You visited one of the missile installations. You noticed that only officers are on duty there.

[Fesunenko] Yes, I saw that. there will be a little more about it in a clip. Only officers, captains...

[Yazov] Yes, that's quite right. That's how responsible we are toward this question.

[Fesunenko] competent, qualified people.

[Yazov] Quite right.

Well fine, you have yourself brought me to talk about what are after all the main, principle problems of our Armed Forces, Dmitriy Timofeyevich. Now, in connection with the perestroyka that is being implemented in our country, our society, I would like to chat about how we now understand our main military doctrine. Let's recall how through the years of Soviet power we were...I would even say active pacifists. We were always saying that we were for peace, but speaking self-critically, the rest of the world did not believe us very much. Why? Because we said were for peace, but we sent troops into Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Afghanistan. We said we were for peace, but let's look the truth in the eye: We had a great many tanks, much more than our potential enemies had, and tanks are not a defensive weapon, they are offensive weapons. So, for a whole number of reasons, they didn't believe us very often in the West. I know this well, because I worked in the West for many years.

Now there is a new policy, the policy of new thinking, a new concept as far as I know, for our defensive military doctrines, and a new attitude from the public for our military doctrines. One would like to hear from you, at first hand, so to speak, how the attitude of the military is changing to their obligations, to the defense of the motherland. As it happens, Tikhon Andreyevich Zimoglyad from Simferopol has telephoned your ministry. They have given me the telephone message from your system. Here is the note: A lot is said in our press about the USSR needing to halt all nuclear tests unilaterally, that we could cut our nuclear arsenal by half or two-thirds without waiting for the conclusion of the treaty on strategic arms which you mentioned. I would like to hear your opinion, Comrade Zimoglyad asks; perhaps such a step is indeed justified. After all, how many billions of rubles we would save! The question is, to put it briefly, thus: Will the changes in military doctrine bring any benefit to the economy, and will there by any savings here for our country and our people?

[Yazov] In 1987 we adopted a pledge and announced it to the world that we adhere to a defensive doctrine. Well, what is a defensive doctrine? It means that we have no intention of attacking anybody, we do not make territorial claims against nobody, and in the final analysis we retreat to the confines of our own borders. We withdrew troops from Hungary, from Czechoslovakia, and we are now withdrawing troops from Germany, Poland, and Mongolia. That is a defensive doctrine. But does that mean we should be without weapons, or not? You said that tanks are a purely offensive weapon. I would say that tanks are good for defense, too. I cannot imagine defense as just sitting in the defensive. Defense also means making counterstrikes and going on to the counteroffensive, and so all types of weaponry are needed. It is another matter with regard to what quantity of these weapons is necessary. I agree that nobody needs to be overarmed today. If we say, and agree with the Americans, that strategic offensive weapons need to be cut by 50 percent, if we have come to an accord that some quantity of armor, tanks, and other equipment needs to be cut, that means we have it in mind that it is not only our country alone that has to make cuts, but the other side as well.

A process of bilateral arms reductions is going on. We will make bigger reduction in the types of weaponry which we have more of and we will make smaller cuts in those which we have less of. And conversely, they perhaps will destroy more of them. It is another matter that not all types of weapons were included in the talks process or the topic of the talks. It is only land forces and air forces that were included. The Navy and the so-called rapid deployment troops were not included, which is to the Americans' advangage and to our disadvantage.

[Fesunenko] That's understandable.

[Yazov] But I think that the process itself of disarmament which has begun in Europe is a positive event, and I think that all peoples win by this. But I agree with the comrades, with the telegram which you read out—we must not be weaponless, but nobody need by overarmed.

[Fesunenko] It makes a heavy burden for the country.

[Yazov] It is a heavy burden on the economy.

[Fesunenko] We shall talk some more about this in a bit more detail, but we have just received a question from a group of Spanish people living in Moscow. It has been brought from the telephone: We mentioned Kuts who fought in the American ranks, that is, on our side but with the Americans, who wants to be considered a war veteran. However this is a group of Spaniards who fulfilled their internationalist duty as translators, in particular, in Cuba, where you also served in the years of the Caribbean crisis in the 1960s. Comrade Erans asks: What do you think, he asks—does this group of Spanish translators who worked together with our servicemen and with you deserve the same incentives which were provided for in your Order Number 220 of 5 June 1990 for Soviet (?people).

[Yazov] I consider that they are also internationalist soldiers, and I took the trouble to gather lists of all those comrades who worked as translators during the Caribbean crisis or during the Spanish events of 1936, and to categorize them as internationalist soldiers.

[Fesunenko] Thank you. I hope that Comrade Erans from the group of Moscow Spaniards heard all that. There is another telephone question from Sergey Vladimirovich Yakovlev. He addresses me, and asks: Fesunenko said that all letters arriving for Yazov would be read and sorted out; does Fesunenko guarantee this? I don't think I can guarantee the satisfaction of every request that arrives for the Ministry of Defense. I can guarantee one thing—that these letters will be passed to the minister's apparatus, and I can even say when—on Monday, the day after tomorrow. We have already agreed with the minister's aide, and a ministry special dispatch rider will come and collect these letters and take them there. As for what the result of examination of your requests will be, that is up to the ministry.

[Yazov] I would like to tell the dear viewers that if there is a return address, we will give a detailed reply to all letters.

[Fesunenko] I should watch what I am saying—there are more than 3,000 letters, so you'll have plenty of work!

[Yazov] Well, now.

[Fesunenko] Good.

[Yazov] I think that if someone has written a letter, he evidently has an interest in the resolution of some problem, and who is to resolve it? Since they have addressed me I should resolve it. It is another matter whether we will satisfy everybody.

[Fesunenko] Yes, that's right, it is very difficult to satisfy everybody.

[Yazov] But we are obliged to reply.

[Fesunenko] Now, again, here is the next bundle of letters and questions. Kirim Utisinov from Tedzhen, Turkemenia, has three questions in one, again about cuts and; the scrapping of medium-range missiles. He asks whether talks are in progress with other nuclear powers about reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons.

[Fesunenko] Here are two interesting letters from children. Oksana Vasilenko, in the ninth grade, from Belgorod. Oksana, can you hear us? Here's your question for the marshal. It's now clear to all, esteeded Comrade Marshal, that the Americans are no longer our enemies, neither are the Japanese nor the Germans. Our only enemy, the enemy of normal people, is Saddam Husayn; this is what the schoolgirl writes. So, why do you keep monstrous rockets? Well, the question is of course naive, which is forgiveable for a little girl.

[Yazov] No, well nevertheless Igor Sergeyevich, such questions are asked not only by children, but are also asked by adults.

[Fesunenko] Adults as well, yes.

[Yazov] They think that if no one is attacking us, and is not preparing to attack, then we need to disarm altogether. But the NATO bloc exists, they hold systematic sessions, they conduct nuclear planning, and you ask against whom?. I think that it is still too early to talk about the dawn of the age of peace; peace has come only because there is parity, and not because all are in agreement. Wars are going on, there has not been practically a single year when there was not a war in the world. Saddam Husayn laid his hands on Kuwait and the United Nations was forced to free Kuwaiti territory. What does this tell us?

[Fesunenko] That we need to keep our powder dry.

[Yazov] Quite right.

[Fesunenko] But we will talk about Iraq later, there are a mass of questions about the Persian Gulf war. Now I would like to raise other issues that concern us, maybe even more than the war in the Persian Gulf—that is the Army and our society. You know, we have received an awful lot of letters, Dmitriy Timofeyevich; people are concerned and sometimes indignant when they write that ever more frequently our Armed Forces are being drawn into our internal, interethnic, and other conflicts—Tbilisi, Baku, Karabakh...

[Yazov, interrupting] Igor Sergeyevich, I will nevertheless answer an interesting question as regards whether any of the other nuclear powers will sit down at the negotiation table with us or not.

[Fesunenko] Yes, there was such a question, that's right.

[Yazov] Yes, I would like to say, esteemed viewers...

[Fesunenko, interrupting] Apart from the United States.

[Yazov, continuing] ...that we and the United States are holding talks, but Britain, France, and China have not yet joined the talks process on nuclear weapons.

[Fesunenko] That's true, yes.

[Yazov] They consider that they have a small amount of nuclear weapons, but we consider that if we resolve the issue of a 50 percent cut, then in the next talks Britain, France, and China must be included.

[Fesunenko] Thank you. So I return to the question that I began to ask. Thank you.

[Yazov] I understood it. I can already answer.

[Fesunenko] Just a second. Nevertheless I will finish it. I want to give the names of the people. You understand, the Army has been drawn into conflicts, soldiers are shooting and killing, and they themselves are suffering. In Namangan five soldiers died, and nothing has been done. Their killers have been released to their homes. The questions that have come in are extremely varied.

Can justification for this be found before the people in assertions that the Armed Forces are the best in the world? That's from reserve Colonel Kashtanov, Valentin Yakovlevich, from Biysk, by the way. He's incensed by the use of the Armed Forces in the Baltic region. Olga Fedorovna Chernyayeva from Kurgan: Why is the Army being used to fight its own people? Comrade Igorev from Moscow: How should the Army behave in areas where there are interethnic and political conflicts? Should soldiers be sent there? Isayev, war veteran and second category invalid: Who gave the order to fire at the unarmed crowd in Lithuania? And there are also other questions. I'll be objective. For instance, Yuriy Anatoliyevich Bazglov from Moscow. No, his question is about Tbilisi and General Rodionov. The opposite viewpoint, that is full support for the Army, comes from Comrade Matasov in Kostroma. His complaint to you, as minister of defense, is, why can't you stop interethnic wars? President Gorbachev and you have been given all necessary powers, writes Comrade Matasov from Kostroma. Why can't you stop the war, the bloodshed, and tears in any republic, break up all the armed militants and punish them, and get the Armed Forces to supervise and protect the peace and public order? You can see what a spectrum of views there is! Some hit out at the Army and others demand that it intervene even more actively.

[Yazov] You see, Igor Sergeyevich, there is also roughly the same spectrum of views in the Supreme Soviet, without whose permission the Army cannot be used.

[Fesunenko] What you say is very important.

[Yazov] Yes, a statement of the procuracy was published recently. The procuracy had carried out a most scrupulous investigation into the state of affairs in Tbilisi in April 1989.

[Fesunenko] Excuse me, do you mean the military procuracy?

[Yazov] Yes the military procuracy.

[Fesunenko] The military procuracy was it?

[Yazov] Yes. No.

[Fesunenko] Or do you mean the USSR procuracy?

[Yazov] The USSR procuracy.

[Fesunenko] Ah, the USSR procuracy.

[Yazov] It has been said loud and clear that the Army was not to blame. Those who were to blame have come to power. Having come to power, those who were to blame are now getting shooting to occur every day. Blood is being spilled in South Ossetia, and no one seems to care. The question that now arises is: What is a soldier? There are soldiers of the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD]. There are also soldiers of the Armed Forces. There are also soldiers of the Committee for State Security [KGB]. But parents who see that someone has a shield and someone has a rifle think that all soldiers are under the Ministry of Defense. I'd like to explain that MVD troops are mainly used. That is their task, their specific job. I don't want to see them used. It's a bad thing they are used. But society has become so politicized. In Vilnius, tens of thousands of people came out from both sides. And many of them carried weapons. People now ask why the Army went out. If the Army had not gone out, more people would have died.

[Fesunenko] But as far as one knows, the order to use weapons was given by the Vilnius Garrison commander, I think.

[Yazov] No one gave the order to use weapons. And no one fired with live cartridges.

[Fesunenko] What do you mean they did not fire? Twenty people were killed—something like that, I don't remember exactly.

[Yazov] Twelve.

[Fesunenko] It was twelve, twelve, excuse me.

[Yazov] It doesn't matter how many died. If they had died from weapons used by the troops, why was it that not a single one of the corpses was examined, why did no one carry out a post mortem examination?

If a post mortem had been carried out they would have been satisfied that the troops did not use weapons. Well, after all, why did somebody have to be buried without the procuracy being given the opportunity to investigate? But the authorities in Vilnius did not give the state procuracy the opportunity to sort things out, let alone the military procuracy. Well, who shot whom? There is a lot of that here now that, well, which many want to cash in, so to speak, on populist statements, on criticism of the Army. Moreover, literally everything is ascribed to the Army. I do not mean that we do not have shortcomings. I am not in favor of the Army being used in Baku, Tbilisi. You spoke about it being used in Namangan. Well, MVD troops were operational in Namangan. Of course, they were also soldiers, also warriors. But nevertheless, when things are bad, they have recourse to soldiers. Well,

things were bad in Uzbekistan. Over 19,000 Meskhetian Turks were brought together in a parachute assault landing regiment and were later taken out of there by plane. Well, why did they have recourse to a soldier, then? Because a soldier has defended and defends. He is a defender. But many see a soldier as a completely different person, as a person who can somehow be humiliated, insulted, and along with him, the officer, and along with the officer, the general. I think that there is much injustice here with regard to the Army in society itself. There are many who are dissatisfied but one should not see the Army as being guilty everywhere of everything.

[Fesunenko] Well, in any event, no matter what, the process of using armed forces should probably be regulated somehow. I do not just mean the armed forces of the Army, but also of the internal troops, the militia, too, in such events which are taking place more and more often in our country. Incidentally, well, following a hot trail—these mighty demonstrations took place in Moscow two days ago and there were many people in military uniform—let's put it like that—in the streets. How many representatives of the armed forces were there?

[Yazov] There were just the same number of armed forces representatives as we had been requested to provide motor vehicles to [changes thought] yes, the streets, and so forth, to partition off the streets. Well, we allocated around 1,000 motor vehicles and consequently 1,000 drivers. We did not allocate other troops. These were troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the militia.

[Fesunenko] Alright. Thank you for the explanation, Dmitriy Timofeyev.

I would like to ask the producer to prepare the next subject. I want to say that while we were preparing this program, we were given the opportunity to visit the combat position in the command post of a unit, of a strategic missile unit, and to film a short report there which should also serve the theme of our next talks. Can we have the video report please?

[Begin recording] [Fesunenko] We are in the command post of a strategic missile regiment. It is from here, from these panels, that the most powerful, the most formidable weapons ever invented by man, intercontinental strategic missiles, able to strike any target on any point of the globe, can be bought into action by pressing the relevant buttons and turning the relevant keys.

But, so that these missiles are never put into action, on duty here day after day, month after month, year after year—all, naturally, being constantly replaced, are weapons crews, Soviet officers who are members of launcher detachments [raketchik]. What question would you like to ask Marshal Yazov?

[Unidentified uniformed officer] I don't want to ask him a question, but I would like to ask that the military reform be accelerated—I mean the introduction of military reform—and that a more productive approach be taken, taking account of all the specific features of all the kinds of troops, because of course it is difficult to embrace all of that, but one should try.

[Fesunenko] But what do you mean when you speak of military reform? Should we go over to a professional army, or something else?

[Officer] A professional army, too. Although, in my view the bringing up to strength of the armed forces should be mixed. The professional should be able to do his business, too, and every citizen of the Soviet Union should go through that school. I am in favor of a professional army. [end recording]

[Fesunenko] Well, the question has just arisen. The member of the launcher detachment has just said that he favors a professional army although in the course of the conversation he says at the same time that young people should perform military service. Among the telephone questions which have just been brought to me, just 30 seconds ago, is one from Konstantin Vasiliyevich Dobrynin from Voronezh. When will hired troops be introduced in our country? Well, the formulation of that is also not quite imprecise—people who are hired for money, a professional army. Mikhail Barmashov, a former servicemen, has just asked by telephone: While I was performing my service, I shot three times from an automatic weapon. That isn't a question, it's a regret. I shot three times in my whole service, firing precisely nine rounds. Well, comrade minister, this is how you want to resist the U.S. Army which has been trained to the limit while our Army is incompetent? Well, I would like to hear what you think about such wishes, questions, and doubts. Will we be able to stand up to a really professionally trained army if the army in our country is not professional?

[Yazov] I would like to explain that we have a cadre army, and those who need to be professionals are professionals. That person in the rocket troops who asked the question is an officer himself.

[Fesunenko] Of course, he is a captain.

[Yazov] He is a professional. All our pilots are professionals. They are officers. But should the whole army be a professional army with volunteer recruitment? I don't think so. The United States has an army based on volunteer recruitment which is two million strong. The National Guard numbers 1.6 million.

[Fesunenko] The National Guard is like our internal troops?

[Yazov] Yes, but...[changes thought] no, not exactly.

[Fesunenko] Not exactly.

[Yazov] But in the Persian Gulf this recruited army proved insufficient, and they had to call up....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] The reservists.

[Yazov] ...the reservists. Why did they call up the reservists? It was because it is impossible for a recruited army to perform tasks in war on its own. The whole people must prepare for war. And how do you prepare the people for war if there isn't a cadre army? He said he fired three times.

[Fesunenko] Yes, nine cartridges in all his years of service.

[Yazov] That's bad.

[Fesunenko] That's bad.

[Yazov] But it seems he served in the construction units. I'm in favor of the construction troops getting involved in combat training, of everyone being prepared to use weapons within the specialist field to which they have been assigned in the event of war. Without getting sidetracked from this question, I'd like to recall Lenin's words that if there is a big war, all the people will fight. The Great Patriotic War showed that all the people did indeed fight. Almost 30 million people were called up into our armed forces, almost the whole of the population that could be called up. What professional or recruited army can replace that? The maintenance of order is another matter. You would not have to call up anybody. You would have 1.5-2 million and get by with that. I don't think that is any way of solving problems. But, we will attempt in the very near future to recruit people on contract for service in the Navy. I agree that it does not pay us to have cadre soldiers in the Navy who will just be serving for a year. They have to study in college for a year, and then serve a year. And if you recruit them on contract, they can serve five or 10 years. It will be easier on the equipment. They will be more competent in mastering complex equipment.

[Fesunenko] Thank you. I see. Seeing as we are talking of army service, we cannot avoid unpleasant questions, unfortunately. I am sorry, Dmitriy Timofeyevich, but there have been a lot of letters and questions about the shady and negative aspects of army service which are written about a lot in the press and which worry our people.

When I was in Leningrad with you—you were meeting veterans—you said very well, I liked your remark, that the Army is not free from society, and inherent in the Army, of course, are certain deficiencies which are characteristics of the country as a whole. And, talking to servicemen, you said that one should not immediately brush off any criticism of the armed forces and immediately call it, as we tend to, an anti-army campaign, a striving to slander, and so forth. One has to be objective. Of course, there are serious critical remarks. There are questions which concern the mass of the people. In this connection I want to ask our producer to present yet another video clip. It is a question addressed directly to you by one Soviet woman whose son is shortly going to go off to serve in the Army. Please let us have the video clip.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified speaker] The opportunity to put a question to the USSR minister of defense and get an answer to it live on the air is one that has attracted many television viewers. Among them were activists of the soldiers' mothers committee. Tatyana Vasilyevna Kuzmina puts her question to you, Dmitriy Timofeyevich. Please go ahead, Tatyana Vasilyevna.

[Kuzmina] Dmitriy Timofeyevich, I have the following question for you. Well, let me tell you a little about myself. I have brought my son up on my own since he was two years old and, of course, you understand how difficult this is for a mother, brining up a son. And now he is on the eve of joining the Army. Three months ago we learned through the general news media that improper relations are perpetrated in the Army which now verge on the criminal. I therefore have the following question: How can protection be provided for our sons who are going into the Army, for our young generation of men of our motherland, against improper conduct, against brutality in the Army, so that people, our children, might come home alive and so that we might place our hopes in you, Dmitriy Timofeyevich, for all human rights are being flouted in the Army. [end recording]

[Yazov] I would like to say that the question you have asked is the main question we are tackling as we examine issues of military discipline. Improper conduct is not simply a defect of some kind. It is a crime which we are combating with all the means available to us. But, I would like to say that a great deal that is extraneous is whipped up around this. We do not have that much in the way of improper relations. Every day I look through all the letters that we receive, all the telegrams which are addressed to me, if they are connected with improper relations. I am not trying to calm you down, but I do want to assure you that out of 10 telegrams the fact that there have been improper relations is confirmed in one or at the most in two cases.

Young people who enter the Army naturally do miss things for a certain time. Somehow he manages to enroll his parents' help, either so he can be moved to some other place, or so his position in fulfilling his service duties can be eased in some other way. They immediately write letters. His parents arrive to sort the matter out and they demand that he be moved to the Ukraine, if he was called up in the Ukraine, or that he be moved to the northern Caucasus, if he was called up in the northern Caucasus. I investigate in the strictest fashion all incidents of non-regulation attitudes and we do not simply battle against all incidents, but we simply make answerable to a military tribunal all those who permit themselves to physically harm a comrade.

I am grateful to the soldiers' mothers for the fact that they do not simply tell someone to somehow take revenge for the fact that their son has perished, or that

their son was subjected to some cruel acts or measures. Soldiers' mothers have examined very many of our documents in the military procuracy and they have become convinced that practically all, or rather all, incidents are examined by the procuracy. It is another matter whether this satisfies or does not satisfy all of them. There are incidents which are simply turned into incidents of contravention of the regulations, but for some reason some parents rule out the possibility of accidents. There are accidents. Someone was having his photograph taken when he fell from a cliff and was badly injured. There are accidents when someone either jumped or fell from some floor in the barracks, or somehow fell under some sort of equipment. I will say frankly that in the Army there is of course a lot of military equipment and a high risk of being injured. We are constantly looking into this. And the main demand made of every commander before he starts some task—carrying out guard duty—the commander is absolutely obliged to brief his personnel on security measures, to tell what these security measures are, and after all he is obliged to teach these security measures.

I deeply suffer every time there is an instance of a soldier perishing in our armed forces. I can imagine—I am a father myself—I can imagine how difficult it is for the mother and father to lose someone during peacetime, but unfortunately such instances do occur. I would like to say to the respected mothers and fathers of soldiers: We have done, and will continue to do everything possible, so that your sons return healthy and uninjured from the armed forces. But to give a 100 percent guarantee that no one will ever, so to speak, in any situation fall under any equipment and so on, it is difficult to guarantee this. But we will try to do all we can to see that there are fewer cases of maiming and death.

[Fesunenko] Thank you, Dmitriy Timofeyevich. With that you have answered questions that have just come in from Yevgeniy Vladimirovich Dmitriyev from Minsk, whose son is serving near Ryazan and is in hospital with a broken jaw, he writes, and from Yelena Nikolayevna Kurakina from Moscow, a pensioner; Vladimir Vasiliyevich Yaltsev, a reserve officer from Klin; Vera Ivanovna Sobora from Pushkino; and many other comrades who have already phoned the studio and raised this subejct. I want to end this painful problem here, and if you'll forgive me, I'm going to be horribly untactful if, so to say, I try to give you, a minister, a piece of advice, but nevertheless this question occurs to me: Why shouldn't you, once a case has been proven indusputably 100 percent—let us say of brutal behavior toward a private either by an older private or by a sergeant-major or sergeant—not simply punish the guilty party, but make the instance public, print a reprimand in the papers, not just in the army one, but in the all-union ones, in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA—because a lot is written about negative things, but I have never read anywhere about the guilty party being punished. Perhaps you could try it like that.

[Yazov] Igor Sergeyevich, we write a lot about it. In KRASNAYA ZVEZDA....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] ...in army ones.

[Yazov] ...in magazines, in PRAVDA, in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA.

[Fesunenko] Usually they write that there has been a case of a soldier being bullied, but on how the guilty party was punished they write very little.

[Yazov] And not just the guilty parties, but about how the commander was punished, they write about that. I accept your advice, that obviously we need to do more about this.

[Fesunenko] And again, in order to end this subject, I want to give you a letter. There is no need to answer it. It is a letter to the special presidential commission for checking the objectivity and completeness of the investigation of deaths and injuries. I must say that in my opinion it has been drawn up using not very courteous expressions, very harsh ones, but since they are women, and the mothers of soldiers, I think you will forgive them this. After all, you are an officer, an honored one, so many years in the Army, and will be indulgent, so to say, toward the harsh expressions.

This is the letter and the telephone numbers to call. Don't respond now, but have a look later, and the comrades already know that the letter and requests have been received to react somehow to some cases of this kind.

[Yazov] You know, I know them all personally.

[Fesunenko] Really?

[Yazov] These mothers: Lidova, Nekrasova, Guberskaya, Terekhova, Limer. I know them personally. I know and can give information now about every son who has died in the Army.

[Fesunenko] Don't do it now. It's better afterwards.

[Yazov] Yes, I agree. That is not the main thing. In the final resort the main thing is to take measures to see that there are no cases of death.

[Fesunenko] Fine. Dmitriy Timofeyevich, our Olga has just brought me three more phone calls, from Andrey Ilyich Sobolev, Aleksandr Vasiliyevich Kolpakov, and Colonel...[changes thought] no, the colonel is on another subject. Well, so far two calls, who don't fully agree with you. Sobolev said on the phone: I spoke personally with cadets—he's talking about the rallies the day before yesterday—who were in Pushkin Street and the side streets around. Their uniform was helmets, jackets, and bulletproof vests. There were cadets there, he writes, from the Chemical Defense College, artillery cadets, and pilot cadets. That is to say, he says, how are we to fit this with the minister's words that there were only drivers there? Perhaps you don't know which cadets were there?

[Yazov] Nothing of the sort. That is not true. First, our nearest chemical college is in Kostroma, in Kostroma.

[Fesunenko] There isn't one in Moscow, then?

[Yazov] We haven't any chemical troops here. I don't know who he was thinking of....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] Perhaps, there was a mistake of some kind....

[Yazov, interrupting] No, no.

[Fesunenko] Right. Then let us end this subject....

[Yazov, interrupting] But I'll take this....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] Right you are.

[Yazov] I will answer him if he has his address.

[Fesunenko] [words indistinct] only his name and surname, by phone.

[Yazov] We will find it. We will find it. I must say that this is....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] Now....

[Yazov] ...a matter of honor, in the final resort.

[Fesunenko] Now, Dmitriy Timofeyevich, I would like to turn to another subject which worries Soviet people in general, and which has been reflected in letters and phone calls and telegrams which have arrived in our office.

This is the question of the withdrawal of our troops, our armed forces, our units and links from the countries of Eastern Europe, the former socialist countries. There is a pile of letters. I will quote a few typical questions. Comrade Voronin from Poltava: Why—actually it's an interesting question, listen—why call up young men for two years if the country cannot withdraw its army from abroad because there is no where to put it? That's one question.

There is another question for Minister Yazov. So, will the help of the German Government in connection with the withdrawal be sent to settle the soldiers being withdrawn and to provide accommodation at home? This is a question from Andrey Aleksandrovich Sulin.

There is a question from Fedor Ivanovich Burlak in a letter. Who decided, and what considerations guided them, in determining the time scale for the withdrawal of our troops from Germany at four years? Retired Colonel Rossoshanskiy from Bishkek in Kyrgyzstan expresses his surprise: Concerning the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Germany via Poland, why are they demanding payment for this in hard currency? Couldn't the withdrawal of troops from Germany have been done by sea? Wouldn't that be cheaper? There are lots of that sort of question. I have quoted some typical ones and, well, people are concerned.

[Yazov] And we are concerned too. Indeed, we are busy with this. So far we have not withdrawn troops via Poland. We are withdrawing them by sea. But it won't be cheaper by sea. The stay of one ship in port costs 50,000 West German marks. So it is not cheaper by ship.

[Fesunenko] It is not cheap.

[Yazov] No, but we are now discussing with the Poles, and with the start of the withdrawal of our troops from Poland they agree to allow the passage of trains. I would not say it will be much cheaper, because every axle is counted. Everything has to be paid for.

[Fesunenko] Here is a question about whether the money paid us by the FRG will be allocated....

[Yazov, interrupting] The money which the FRG gives us to withdraw our troops is allocated like this....

[Fesuenko, interrupting] This is interesting.

[Yazov] 7.8 billion marks is going to build cantonments for soldiers and officers' homes for the officer staff—with all the social and cultural facilities. Apart from that they will build us four factories for the production of bricks, or earthenware, or some other equipment to produce houses.

The firms with which we have already concluded contracts will start work in the very near future, in Vladikavkaz, in the Ukraine, Belorussia, and a number of other places. This 7.8 billion will be spent over a period of four years, and 36,000 apartments will be built. But, naturally, that is not enough. For the withdrawal we are taking all the measures we can, and are doing some building ourselves. This year we will build somewhere around 76,000 to 78,000 apartments. All the construction units and all the material resources available to us in the armed forces—everything has been thrown into actually building housing, first and foremost for the officer corps.

The comrade asks what is the point in calling people up if there is nowhere to put them.

[Fesunenko] Yes, yes.

[Yazov] I would like to say that it all comes down to the fact that there is nobody for us to call up now. Today, there is a shortfall of personnel in the armed forces. What is occurring now is the latest demographic decline, one that has, nevertheless, gone on for some time. What we are seeing is the absence of children from those who were not born during the war. This demographic decline has been going on for 15 years, and only around approximately 1994 will we have the number of young men needed to ensure a full complement in the armed forces. Today we do not call up students. The same goes for those who study at technical establishments, such as those for....

[Fesunenko, interrupts] Nautical colleges, and so on.

[Yazov] Nautical colleges and so on. We do not call them up either. In general, we call up approximately 47 percent of the young men we could call up.

[Fesunenko] Good, thank you. We have a whole series of questions concerning international problems and our armed forces. But before we move on to them I would like to ask one question which I forgot to ask when we were discussing improper conduct in the Army. This bothers me from the professional point of view as a journalist—improper conduct by the army toward journalist colleagues of mine. You know, I would like to note with alarm that for the number of journalists who die on duty we are moving into first place, even reaching a level equivalent to Colombia where there is a drugs war going on and where three or four journalists die per season, so to speak.

In our country, also, I think three have died, and here, behind camera four, they are pointing at cameraman Brezhnev who was wounded, a "Vzglyad" operator, in Vilnius, and you know that several cameramen have died. I would like...[changes thought] there is no point in explaining these accidents here. I can not suppose that it is some policy, that this is all being done deliberately, but all the same, Dmitriy Timofeyevich, I would like to ask you to say once and for all to your servicemen colleagues that journalists and cameramen who are filming these processes of pacification, the elimination of disorders, must not be shot at. They are working. They are not rioting. They are not carrying [word indistinct]. They are just filming, and the very fact that a journalist or photographer is shot goes to show that those who are shooting or who beat him up feel that he is doing something wrong, you understand. I would like you to say how you feel about this.

[Yazov] Igor Sergeyevich, I would like to say the journalist must not be shot, and the bystander who might get shot must not be shot either.

[Fesunenko] No one must be shot, but the bystander knows what he is letting himself in for....

[Yazov, interrupting] No one must be shot at.

[Fesunenko] ...he carries a slogan, he can run away, but the journalist does not run away. He is the photographer, the cameraman. He records. He is on duty. Therefore, this....

[Yazov, interrupting] But I think the comrade you were speaking about was indeed defended by soldiers. Those who were doing the shooting or the beating were not soldiers but other people. And you know, I have seen a report on television which described how civilians, Sajudis supporters or young people of some kind....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] Of course there were cases of that kind. I myself went on "Vremya" with a sharp condemnation of the Sajudis people who had beaten up two of my colleagues from our editorial department in the capital. So I certainly do not want to accuse just the Army of such violations. Sajudists and left wing nationalists alone. That is my only request and that is all there is to it.

[Yazov] In general I think that no one should be killed.

[Fesunenko] That is also correct.

[Yazov] All the same, you know the most straightforward, the most open, the most good-hearted person is the soldier. I was with these soldiers at the earthquake, at that disaster that took place in Armenia, and I can say that there the soldier showed himself to be a person with a capital "P" within the full meaning of the word. You know they found sacks full of money and they handed over everything to the state. They were sorting through the ruins of a school and the battalion did not go away until the last child who was dead had been brought out of the rubble. That's the kind of person the soldier is.

[Fesunenko] Thank you. Now I am going to ask Svetlana Maslyukova, the producer, to provide another question which is meant for you and which even comes in fact from overseas. Please be so kind, Svetlana.

[Correspondent V. Shishkovskiy] Hello Moscow. This is London on the line. Esteemed Dmitriy Timofeyevich, we have prepared a pleasant surprise for you. You have no doubt recognized already the person who very much wants to talk to you today. He is here with me. He is Admiral James Eberle, who until recently was director of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Here they still remember the address by Yazov, the Soviet minister of defense, to the staff of the institute during your last visit to Great Britain. Very good relations were established at that time with Admiral James Eberle who responded with pleasure to the invitation to take part in today's program.

[Eberle in English with superimposed Russian translation] Dmitriy Timofeyevich, it's very good to be with you again. My question concerns military cooperation between East and West. It is widely accepted here that cooperation and openness between the military of the East and the West have a great part to play in building confidence between our countries. What further steps would you like to see put into effect which would develop cooperation between the military in the Soviet Union and the military in the West?

[Yazov] I greet you, admiral. It is pleasant for me, too, to meet you on the air. I would like to say that all armies pay very great attention to the problem of relations between the armed forces.

We have concluded several agreements with the United States on safe operations at sea and in the air, and we even notify the United States about the launch of every one of our training missiles, so that they don't think that the missile is heading for the United States, so to speak. When Mr. King, your defense secretary, was here we discussed with him all the issues connected with possible incidents at sea, on land, and in the air. In this line of

work, we discussed them with the Italians and with other states as well. I think this will bear new fruit in that there will be fewer violations of airspace; there will be less anxiety for people that some missile might arrive from somewhere or other, and I think this will help to strengthen peace and secure the existence of mankind itself on our planet.

[Fesunenko] Thank you, Dmitriy Timofeyevich. Now that we have gone on to international affairs, to international problems, as I said there have been lots of telephone calls, and there has been a pile of letters. Excuse me if there is not enough time left to give all the names. That is not possible. We have 15 minutes until the end of the program.

[Yazov] There are a lot about the Persian Gulf, aren't there?

[Fesunenko] On the Persian Gulf, quite so. Retiree Pavel Vasilyevich Sidorin; Kolyas from Moscow; Kharitonov, a participant in the Great Patriotic War from Bekabad, Tashkent Oblast; and masses of other comrades—the synthesis of all these questions can be boiled down to a sentence from the letter of retiree Pavel Vasilyevich Sidorin: The Iraqi Army has weapons made mainly in the Soviet Union. How could it happen that the Iraqi Army was routed in four days? One can't help thinking that our weapons—excuse me, I am quoting—are not worth a damn.

[Yazov] That would not be my reckoning. The whole thing is that weapons do not fight by themselves. Weapons fight when someone is in control of them and is using them. I have also received a pile of letters and phone calls on this issue, Igor Sergeyevich. I would like to say that the correlation of forces was far from in Iraq's favor, particularly as far as new types of weapon are concerned. But, I would like to say that while the Americans had 4,400 new tanks concentrated there—the Abrams, Challenger, and others—of the 4,160 Iraqi tanks, only 750 were T-72 tanks. And those were in the National Guard, which incidentally did not go into action, and a considerable proportion of the divisions were destroyed before the advance toward Kuwait. Or take aircraft: The overall correlation for aircraft was 13 to one.

[Fesunenko] To the Americans' advantage, of course, the advantage of the multinational forces.

[Yazov] Well, the multinational force. How many aircraft were there? For example, how many MiG-29's? There were 33 of them. How can these 33 aircraft be compared with that huge force which was concentrated there. And the SU-24, that is a ground attack aircraft, or rather, that is to say, a bomber. Some 30 of them were manufactured by us. The SU-25—64 of them. How could such a quantity of airpower really hope to destroy anything?

Moreover, respected viewers, I must say that before the Americans started carrying out their air offensive, they fired missiles—Tomahawk missiles—over a long distance, which did not come within the zone which could be picked up on radar. All the aerodromes were put out of action. All the radar was put out of action. Control points and antenna systems were damaged and, in practical terms, Husayn's army could hardly be given direction. Everyone fought relying on their own means as it were. And even by the troop resources, it must be said they managed to achieve a lot. More than 90 aircraft were destroyed. Therefore, I would like to say that that war is no indicator of that Soviet technology is bad.

In saying this, I am not belittling the merits of U.S. technology, particularly computer technology, particularly that technology which they have on aircraft and on missiles. There was a program fitted to every missile, and the missile flew as it was programmed. This is undoubtedly a colossal achievement both of scientific thought and of technology. I cannot say that U.S. technology is poor, but at the same time, I would also not agree that our technology is, as it was expressed "not worth a damn." Which army this technology is in, and who trained it and in what way—this is something else.

During these events we were visited by Talas, the Syrian defense minister, and he himself told me that their ninth Syrian tank division took part in these events. The tanks went a thousand kilometers through the desert, and not one tank stopped.

[Fesunenko] Were they Soviet-produced?

[Yazov] Yes, Soviet-produced. I was amazed. At the same time, he said the Abrams tanks stopped over 100-150 kilometers in order to have their filters cleaned. Their engines are gas turbine ones and they suck in a lot of air, and along with the air they took in a lot of dust. So, it must not be said that our technology is backward, or bad.

[Fesunenko] Dmitriy Timofeyevich, again notes have been coming in containing a severe reproach of me. People are saying that the "Who's Who" program is about major political problems, about the armed forces, about the war, and so on. But the guest on the program has not said a word—and I clearly haven't—you are saying nothing about yourself. I, for example, have followed you and your work rather closely, and I know that the minister of defense gets up at about 0600, starts work at 0700, and his work ends at about midnight. That's what I know. Perhaps you yourself could say a word or two in reply to Valentina Mikhaylovna Suranova's question. Where did you do battle and on what fronts? Tell us a little about your family, about yourself, and about your children. Two or three words, we only have a little time left.

[Yazov] I thought I had already told you something about myself before the program started.

[Fesunenko] You have not said anything. You have only said a few words. It was rather like answering a questionnaire. But can you tell us more in human terms?

[Yazov] Well, I attended the Moscow Supreme Soviet college. During the war I was evacuated to Novosibirsk. We, lads from Siberia, were assembled there, and after the victory of the battle for Moscow we, as victors, naturally came to Moscow. I completed my studies at a college here, at Solnechnegorsk, in summer camps. In July we were released, and sent right away to the front at Volkhov. In 1942 it was proposed to break through the blockade of Leningrad—in August, 1942. Despite the fact that the operation went on for about a month, or perhaps even longer, we were unable to break through the blockade because of the swampy marshland. Tanks could not be used, only infantry. There were no means of reinforcement. I was wounded there literally on the second or third day after the start of the offensive on 28 August. When I recovered I went back to my regiment—177th Division. After being wounded a second time I ended up in Leningrad, and after recovery I began to serve at the Leningrad front. And so, the war ended there.

Well, after the war, naturally, I got married. We had two children. My wife died in 1975 here in Moscow.

[Fesunenko] Well, it's more or less clear....

[Yazov, interrupting] Well, in 1979....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] Worldly matters.

[Yazov]...I married for the second time.

[Fesunenko] You know, I....

[Yazov, interrupting] I have four grandsons. (?Emma Yevgeniyevna) has three grandsons. So we have seven grandsons, a big family!

[Fesunenko] I must say—I will reveal a small secret—I together with Dmitriy Timofeyevich, went to Leningrad recently. I already mentioned this. Absolutely impromptu, without any preparation, you took me in and showed me the artistic gems which are kept there. This was a very interesting excursion, quite unusual, through the main headquarters. This was an excursion with an art expert, so to speak. You showed me sculptures, pictures, told me who was who, what was what, and you quoted sentences, thoughts, virtually pages from our great military commanders.

I saw that the minister is well acquainted with military history. this disarms me, greatly disarms me, you know. At the meeting with your messmates in Leningrad you spoke a lot about how you don't have any spare time, but to judge from the fact that you recited poetry by heart, you do sometimes read poetry. I have even heard that you write it. I don't want to ask you to quote reams of poetry, but some line which serves as a slogan, a motto for your life, so to say, which sums up some principle of your worldly life, and your attitude toward life, the army, toward problems, your family, people. Perhaps you can remember some, (?dredge some up)?

[Yazov] I would like to say:

Generals are always responsible for a thousand souls.

They answer directly for all failures and losses.

Yet it is harder for them, greybeards, to engage in the soldier's drudgery;

The general and soldier are equal soldiers in the field.

You know, many people think that generals are something connected with, well, the good life and so on, but many don't know that generals go into battle with their soldiers, that generals are constantly on exercises with their soldiers. It depends on what kind of general. There are generals on the staff, but there are generals commanding divisions, who are responsible for 12-15,000 men, and there are generals who, like the officers where you went [nuclear command center] are on duty along wth the officers at the missile positions, but at the command post. There are generals who are permanently on duty at the air defense command posts. But people don't see generals at work. They only see generals when they are either on parade, or in the theater: there's a general!

[Fesunenko] Dmitriy Timofeyevich.

[Yazov] After all, now the time is such, as a result of the development of arms technology, that it is not so much the soldier who works and is in charge of hardware, as it is the officer, as it is the general.

It is a paradox, but before it was the soldiers who fought bayonet to bayonet, into the charge, and so on. Now logic does the fighting, now the weapons are guided, the weapons must be guided. Can an untrained person guide weapons? He cannot. Soldiers launch crafts into space. They work in terms of calculations. And you know, there is a lot of danger involved.

You need to know a lot, have a lot of skills, to do a lot. Many have the idea that a general only needs to occupy himself with some sort of office work. But no, generals also bear a huge physical load. Like soldiers, like officers.

[Fesunenko] So if I have understood you rightly, it is very important in the army now to study, study, and study again. Today's soldier is first and foremost a highly educated person in any military speciality.

[Yazov] You know, Igor Sergeyevich, it is not now simply that the officer must constantly work on himself. The general must work on himself constantly too. If he doesn't work on himself for a few months, he will already fall behind.

[Fesunenko] Thank you. Well, esteemed comrades, our program has come to an end. On your behalf, on my behalf, on behalf of the whole production team which worked on the "Who's Who" program, I would like to sincerely thank our guest Marshal Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, minister of defense of the USSR, who came and answered your questions. I repeat that there were very

many questions. They will all be handed on to the Ministry of Defense staff. I guarantee that.

Now, in ending the program, I would like to thank you for your attention and announce the guest of our next program, which will be on 27 April, in a month's time. The guest on our next program will be Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Please send him letters, questions, requests. Anatoliy Ivanovich is a person very experienced in all state affairs. He is chairman of the parliament. By education he is a lawyer, a jurist. Perhaps somewhere, in some distant towns and villages some problems have arisen with the allocation of powers, of rayon committees, rayon executive committees, and you don't know how to get out of the situation. Please send your questions to Anatoliy Ivanovich, your requests, advice. We are awaiting for them here in Moscow, on television, questions for the program "Who's Who," for Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov for 27 April.

Once again, thank you Dmitriy Timofeyevich. Thank you, comrade viewers. All the best, good bye until we meet again on the "Who's Who" program.

Shevardnadze on Perestroyka's Chances

LD0104112591 Hamburg DPA in German 1053 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] Hamburg (DPA)—Soviet state President Mikhail Gorbachev, according to former Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, still has "a chance" to realize his policy of restructuring. To this end the population's supply of staple foods would have to be safeguarded in the next three to four months, he said in an interview with the Hamburg-based magazine STERN, to be published on Thursday. The whole development depends on the domestic situation. The military too should be "put in their place".

At the same time Shevardnadze warned against chaos, anarchy, and civil war in his country. "The great danger for Europe, and in particular the Federal Republic, is an unstable Soviet Union", the former foreign minister said. Political power in the Soviet Union is currently "as good as paralyzed." In order to rescue the country all forces must come together in a "government based on national understanding and reconciliation."

Shevardnadze said that the influence of reactionary forces was on the increase in the Soviet Union. "They represent the greatest danger." At the same time, the cofounder of perestroyka admitted to wrong assessments in the past. He and President Mikhail Gorbachev should have tackled perestroyka "much more boldy and more determinedly."

Shevardnadze called on the West for greater economic involvement. The foundation stone for setting up a pan-European economic region should be laid by the end of this century.

An edited version of the interview was conveyed to the German press agency.

Pugo Interviewed on 28 Mar Demonstration

LD3003154291 Moscow TASS in English 1514 GMT 30 Mar 91

[By correspondent Boris Shestakov]

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—The March 28 unsanctioned meeting in the capital—and this is not concealed by meeting organisers themselves—was designed to put strong pressure on participants in a congress of Russia's people's deputies that opened on the same day, Soviet Interior Minister Boris Pugo told TASS.

He recalled that the previous meeting had ended with an attempt to break through to the Red Square.

There was information that a similar attempt was made on March 28 as well. There were calls to surround the Kremlin with a human chain and not let congress delegates out if they make unwelcome decisions, Pugo said.

"We were simply forced to take measures to ensure the freedom of deputies, and prevent pressing against them. No additional troops were brought to Moscow. Only units of Moscow militia, units of Interior-Ministry troop stationed here as well as cadets from military academies and individual units of the Moscow garrison were called in. Military hardware was not used. Lorries served only as transportation vehicles."

On the whole, the minister believes, the city has calmed down. On the part of deputies, there are no complaints about the maintenance of order. "But, since we know that new demosntrations are being planned out, we have to keep Militia and Interior Ministry troops stationed in Moscow on a high alert to prevent or eliminate any possible unrest. [no closing quotation mark as received]

Speaking about applications for demonstrations, filed with the Moscow City Council, Pugo voiced hope that deputies would show common sense and prudence.

Let them realise, he said, that the Cabinet of Ministers has been empowered not to permit any massive actions on these days.

"We hope that, like on March 28, columns of demonstrators will refrain from trying to force their way to the centre of the capital and will not attempt through their presence to put pressure on deputies.

"We shall do everything to prevent that. If organisers arrange a meeting somewhere away from deputies' place of work and residence, let them remember that such a meeting has not been sanctioned and that they will have to bear full responsibility," Pugo said.

MVD, KGB Report on Demonstration

LD3003143191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1250 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar (TASS)—Here follows a text received by TASS as an official report from the USSR Interior Ministry [MVD] and KGB:

In Moscow on 28 March, the law enforcement bodies, in accordance with the USSR Cabinet of Ministers decree issued on 25 March this year, carried out a series of preventative measures aimed at guaranteeing order and civil security and at maintaining a situation of calm and normal life in the capital. These measures were well-founded and timely and were not in the least bit threatening in character. The normal working rhythm of the city was almost completely preserved.

The forces of law and order established a safe free area in the central part of Moscow adjacent to the Kremin to eliminate the possibility of any attempts to insult or offend the honor and reputation of people's deputies participating in the Third Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. There were dozens of anonymous telephone calls and reports made to the state security and internal affairs bodies reporting possible explosions and arson at places where deputies reside or places they frequent, and there were reports of special groups being prepared on Red Square to exert moral and physical pressure on deputies "not sharing their views." Unfortunately, such incidents had already taken place.

There was no "surrounding" of the Kremlin and the deputies by the militia and armed servicemen, nor was the way to the congress "beneath the barrels of machine guns." The statements about this are, to put it mildly, an invention. The strictest observance of legality, restraint, and discipline on the part of the law enforcement bodies did, in essence, stop those intent on putting pressure on the deputies. As is well known, it is considered normal practice throughout the world for the work of legislative assemblies to be protected against any sort of pressure from a crowd.

The forces of law and order also had to take account of the danger of possible serious consequences in the event of a demonstration of many thousands taking place in the center of the capital during working hours, which would paralyze the functioning of vitally important municipal services over a wide radius. The organizers intended to assemble up to 500,000 people on Manezh Square for a so-called meeting with deputies without taking into account the real possibilities for ensuring that mass events are held safely. A number of people openly called on participants to enter Red Square for provocative purposes. A test of the reliability of the forces of law and order had already been held on 10 March, when more than 1,000 participants in a rally tried to break onto Red Square.

Measures were taken to prevent criminal elements from using the concentration of large masses of people to commit robberies, hooliganism, and so on. It could not be ruled out that criminal elements might use the situation which arose to perpetrate attacks and terrorist acts. This might have been against the will of the organizers of the rally, whose efforts to safeguard order were mainly for appearances. In some places the situation was on the verge of getting out of control. Repeated appeals and attempts to provoke breaches of law and order, to block the movement of municipal transportation, and to break through barriers and cordons were noted, as well as cases of disobedience to militia officers and insults aimed at them. Individual breaches of the law occurred with the overt connivance and even the participation of some people's deputies.

It should be noted that militia personnel and servicemen displayed self-possession and discipline while carrying out their duties in difficult conditions. They bore a heavy moral and physical burden. The militia officers and servicemen did not have weapons, and they all tackled the set tasks responsibly.

The organizers of the rallies in Moscow did not receive the support on which they had counted. Around 50,000 people took part in them, including passers-by.

The law-enforcement bodies are receiving appeals from deputies and many citizens expressing approval of their actions to maintain order in Moscow. They are considered necessary and timely. Soviet people are expressing the hope that, at this difficult time for the country, the law-enforcement bodies will steadfastly fulfill the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, president, and Cabinet of Ministers regarding the maintenance of law and order and public security.

The bodies of the USSR MVD and KGB continue to carry out measures to control the situation, which remains complex.

Politburo Assesses Referendum Results

PM3103173091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Apr 91 First Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo"]

[Text] At its routine session the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, under the chairmanship of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, examined the question of the political results of the USSR referendum and the tasks of party organizations. The resolution adopted notes that the all-Union referendum held 17 March 1991 in accordance with a decision of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies was a major political event and an important stage in the country's democratic transformations.

The referendum was prepared and held in conditions of confrontation between the supporters of the Union and those who advocate its destruction. In a number of places the USSR Constitution was flagrantly violated

and much was done to prevent people from exercising the right to express their view on a vital question in our country's life.

With a torrent of rallies, strike calls, and shameless slander in their own press organs, pamphlets, and placards, the destructive forces, displaying intolerance toward those with different views, finally discarded their democrats' masks and revealed their true objectives, which have nothing in common with the people's interests. Interethnic conflicts were exacerbated, and the crime rate increased. At the same time certain foreign organizations stepped up the pressure on public opinion in the USSR.

The referendum could not but be seriously affected by the economic situation in the country. The disruption of economic ties and the fall in production, strikes and the decline in labor discipline, and shortages of goods and rising prices have maximized social tension in society.

Nevertheless, the resolution notes, in these conditions more than 76 percent of those who took part in the referendum came out in favor of the renewal of the Union, a federation of sovereign republics, the socialist choice, equality for the peoples, and guaranteed rights and freedoms for people of any nationality throughout the country's territory. They came out in favor of political stability, the strengthening of economic and cultural ties among the peoples of the USSR, and the Union as a factor for peace and security. In general the preparations for and course of the referendum showed clearly that in a difficult and crucial time for the country, the people's wisdom and common sense will prevail, that they will resist all the devious maneuvers of destructive forces, and that it is possible to adopt well-considered decisions on a statewide scale together, by democratic means. That is the chief political result of the referendum.

At the same time, the document says, concern is caused by the fact that a considerable proportion of voters said "no" or did not take part in the vote. But it would be wrong to classify all of them as opponents of the Union. A large proportion of them were expressing their dissatisfaction with the present situation in society. Hence one of the most important conclusions for all the party's practical activity: that the situation must change radically for the better. The referendum results attest that the course of the country's highest organs of power, the CPSU, and other patriotic forces, a course of renewing and preserving the Union, has the support of the vast majority of workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia. This gives everyone who adheres to a position of respect for the Constitution and the law the right to act resolutely and consistently. A range of measures in the economic sphere must be implemented more actively. Everything possible must be done to restore economic ties, halt the decline in production, and step up urgent measures to stabilize it, that is, more resolutely to put into practice the anticrisis program adopted by the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Socioeconomic tasks are now acquiring strategic importance. This is where the people's prosperity and tranquillity lie.

In conjunction with such actions, it is necessary resolutely to proceed by lawful means to strengthen order, tighten discipline, alleviate conflicts, and stabilize the situation; otherwise, the threat of dictatorship—from both left and right extremist forces—grows. It is the duty of communists and all who care about the fatherland's fate to halt reaction, safeguard and continue the democratic transformations, and ensure strict compliance with constitutional norms and the rule of law.

The referendum results create the necessary preconditions for completing work on the Union treaty, the document stresses. Delay is impermissible here, because opposition forces are already trying to disavow the referendum results and once again sink crucial questions in a morass of futile debate. There can be no automatic secession from the Union. The law must operate here too, with all the ensuing consequences, including the loss of the advantages associated with belonging to the Union. On this matter the party's principled approach is this: total guarantees of the individual's rights, irrespective of nationality, and rejection of any attempts whatever to substitute for a political and economic union of republics a purely economic union, or to create parallel power structures on the basis of various kinds of agreements.

The conclusion of a Union treaty depends on the efforts of all the republics. In this context particular concern is caused by the inconsistency of the statements and actions of a section of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] leadership, which is fraught with the risk of destroying both the USSR and the Russian Federation itself. Yet Russia was always the consolidating force of the USSR. And those who assume responsibility in the people's name for delaying or hindering the conclusion of the Union treaty are in effect pursuing a pernicious antipopular policy.

The Politburo believes that the referendum results were influenced positively by the party's collaboration with mass social movements and political organizations committed to the country's democratic development. An awareness of the importance of this crucial moment was displayed by trade unions, the Komsomol, social organizations of women and veterans, and a number of creative unions. Representatives of the majority of religious faiths came out in support of the referendum.

The Communist Parties of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia (CPSU) worked purposefully in a difficult situation, in an atmosphere of outright persecutions and bans. The communist parties of Azerbaijan and the Ukraine managed to transform the situation and, together with all sound, truly democratic forces, to achieve good results. Many of the mass media and the

newspapers of local party committees took up an assertive stance. A constructive role was played by the generally well-considered, objective stance of Central Television.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo drew attention to the fact that the preparations for the referendum also revealed serious shortcomings in the activity of party committees. In many cases they failed to take account of the unique nature of the moment and the character of the political struggle or to draw up a flexible, assertive program of action. Certain members of the CPSU Central Committee, the Central Committees of Union republic communist parties, and local party committees failed to show the necessary activeness. The contribution of certain party media to the propaganda campaign in support of the referendum was belated and inadequate in its scale.

The Politburo recommended that the results of the referendum be analyzed in depth and discussed at the Union republic Communist Party Central Committees and party reskoms [republic committees], kraykoms [kray party committees], obkoms [oblast party committees], gorkoms [city party committees], and raykoms [rayon party committees], which should self-critically draw the appropriate conclusions for their own work. Measures should be implemented to strengthen party discipline. Communists should step up their activity to implement the 28th CPSU Congress decisions and resolutely rebuff those forces which are revising the referendum results and trying to split the party into debating societies, platforms, and factions, thereby diverting the communists' attention from political work among the masses and from the country's socioeconomic life.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo stated that in conditions where a tough struggle is under way between different social forces for influence on the masses and for their political choice, the CPSU should complete as quickly as possible the drafting of its own new program, and publish the draft for discussion. The program should contain clear, humanist goals that meet the interests of the broad strata of working people, and should be a very important factor in rallying the entire party around these goals.

The CPSU mass media are advised cogently and concretely to inform all strata of the country's population and the foreign public about the conclusion arising from the referendum results, namely, that the choice in favor of a renewed Union was made not by a particular party, association, or group of individuals, but by all patriotic movements, by the majority of the people. To continue destructive actions in any form is contrary to the principles of democracy and humanism and goes against the people's will and constructive trends in world politics.

The Politburo instructed the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat; Union republic Communist Party Central Committees; and party reskoms, kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms to formulate a plan of action to implement the tasks arising from the assessments made in the present resolution.

Politburo's Luchinskiy Holds News Conference

PM3103130991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 91 Second Edition p 3

[S. Oganyan report: "Press Vocation"]

[Text] P. Luchinskiy, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave a news conference yesterday within the framework of the seminar for heads of press sectors and leaders of press centers at Union republic Communist Party Central Committees and CPSU raykoms and obkoms [rayon and oblast party committees] on the topic "The Tasks of the Party Press at the Contemporary Stage."

In his introductory address P. Luchinskiy noted that we are living in difficult times. In this situation the role of the mass media is particularly enhanced. Journalism is considered the fourth power in the state—maybe even the third in ours—he said. We cannot reach correct conclusions without a broad vision of the situation within the country.

When characterizing the current political situation, the CPSU Central Committee secretary described it as exceptionally complex. We have grown up in a concrete society and everyone is connected with what has happened and what will happen, he said. It would be unreasonable to expect radical changes. Our path is that of transforming society. Another generation will engage in its direct renewal.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary said that we are often reproached for not having a plan of reforms. But can there really be detailed plans here? In our history we have already assessed in full the nature of rigid planning. When announcing perestroyka, we could not of course foresee a whole number of elements.

An appreciable number of notes with questions piled up in front of the Central Committee secretary during this brief speech.

[PRAVDA] What parties and movements are ready to cooperate with the CPSU?

[Luchinskiy] Take the experience of the referendum. The CPSU has vigorously cooperated with trade union, women's, and veterans' movements and young people. Cooperation at the level of labor collectives may also be promising. We must seek allies in all cases and avoid the danger of isolation.

[PRAVDA] How will the discussion of the draft new CPSU Program go?

[Luchinskiy] The text will soon be sent to members of the Program Commission—140 of them—and also to party committee first secretaries. It is a short program.

We will publish it in about a month and the discussion will begin. As for authorship, as one of you asked, a large number of scientists, experts, and party officials took part in formulating the program.

[PRAVDA] What is your opinion of the situation regarding Central Television, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, and SOBESEDNIK?

[Luchinskiy] Healthy processes are taking place in television. In many respects this is being facilitated by the creation of the [television] company. We will live like a civilized state. The talk about Television News Service and other programs is artificially exaggerated. As for the reproaches that we lack an alternative broadcasting service, you only have to hear "Radio Rossii" to realize that "Liberty" cannot hold a candle to it. Now a word about the youth press... Some publications are carried away by sex, while others, keeping their former titles, have abandoned youth topics altogether. The Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] Central Committee should busy itself here. We are also thinking about this.

[PRAVDA] How do you regard Yeltsin's actions? What can we expect of the coming Congress of Russian Peoples Deputies?

[Luchinskiy] Our stance is vulnerable in that we go from one extreme to the other. Yeltsin must be judged on his actions. It is almost a year since he came to power. What has he achieved? Well, has the center hampered him? Nothing of the sort. I do not think that we should be talking about Yeltsin at all, but about his policy. As for the coming congress' decisions, the deputies will adopt them.

[PRAVDA] Does PRAVDA's stance accord with the position of a flagship newspaper?

[Luchinskiy] PRAVDA shares the same difficulties as the country and the party. It has to become accustomed to working in conditions of pluralism and in the presence of an opposition.

[PRAVDA] How do you regard the analysis of the political situation in the country conducted by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee?

[Luchinskiy] Some people welcome the Russian Communist Party for its staunch, clear position, while others accuse it of orthodoxy. Well, it's a young party.

Shenin Chairs Party Cadre Session

91UN1176A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 27 Mar 91 p 2

[Article by V. Ragozin: "Small But Precious"]

[Text] This can justifiably be said about the CPSU primary organizations. Contradictory processes—both alarming and hopeful—are taking place here today. These processes are at the center of attention of the permanent committee of the CPSU Central Committee for renewing the activity of the primary party organizations.

At the regular commission meeting, which was led by its chairman, Politburo member and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee O. Shenin, immediate measures for consolidating the party ranks were discussed. Speaking on behalf of the work group created especially for study of the question was A. Teplenichev, Central Committee Secretariat member and secretary of the party committee of the Novolipetsk Metallurgical Combine.

Party committee secretaries sharing their ideas in a situation of candid comradely discussion included Yu. Bogadnov from the Rizhskiy Elektromashinostroitelnyy Zavod Association, V. Lyakishev from the Moscow Scientific Research Institute, A. Chausov from the Chelyabinsk Metallurgical Combine, N. Sapozhnikov, first secretary of the Udmurt Obkom [oblast committee], and other members of the commission and its advisers. As a result the primary party organizations in the near future will have detailed recommendations on how to consolidate their ranks more rapidly and effectively.

PRAVDA Account of Gorbachev TV Interview

PM2903174191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Surmounting the Crisis and Getting to Grips With the Situation. USSR President M.S. Gorbachev on Central Television"]

[Text] Answering questions put by L.P. Kravchenko, chairman of the All-Union State Television and Radio Company, and Political Observer I.S. Fesunenko, M.S. Gorbachev dwelt on topical issues that are worrying Soviet people. How do you assess the referendum results? That was the first question.

[Gorbachev] The referendum took place in a complex situation. We had reached an acute phase in implementing the perestroyka course. On the one hand, very profound changes are taking place, changes which society needs in order to be able to recover, get its second wind, and attain new forms of life. This applies to the economy, politics, the spiritual sphere, and interethnic relations. At such a stage one can always predict anxiety, alarm, hesitation, debate, and sometimes even conflicts. This is all taking place here, particularly as the deep-lying processes are occurring in a society that is weighed down with problems.

Let me remind you how the question of a referendum arose. At some stage we all recognized that if in a country where so many people live a formula for renewing the multinational state is not found, then it will be difficult to resolve the pressing problems. Many proposals were thought up on ways of transforming it, on what form it should take. It was then that I became deeply convinced that the people themselves should have the last say on

this question. Having consulted with my leadership colleagues, with people's deputies, and with members of the intelligentsia, I came to the conclusion that I had to use my constitutional right and presidential powers and put the question to the Congress of People's Deputies.

[Fesunenko] The referendum was by and large successful. No doubt about that. People in the country and abroad say so. Yet six republics did not participate: the Baltic republics, Moldova, Georgia, and Armenia. Moreover, their leaders took up a blatantly confrontational stance on the question whether or not to be part of our country, and some of them bluntly stated their wish to secede from the USSR. How can this situation correspond to the referendum results?

[Gorbachev] I rate the referendum results highly. Despite all the predictions, the people went and voted in the referendum— 80 percent of all registered voters. And 76 percent of them said "yes" to the Union as a renewed federation of sovereign republics. This is of enormous significance, and not only in the context of the solution of the problems of the Union itself. After the referendum it was as if we could all feel the firm ground beneath our feet, sure again that our Union was a priceless asset, that all of us need it, now and in the future. People have realized that only together can we can cope with common problems and resolve the difficulties facing us.

When you consider that on the eve of the referendum a draft new Union treaty—prepared by the republics and examined at the Federation Council—was published and people were able to see for themselves the shape of the future Union, then, by voting for its preservation, they were effectively approving the draft Union treaty as well.

This says much for Soviet people's civic maturity. They were able to rise above today's difficulties and say how they stand on a question of principle.

Now the second question. Indeed, the referendum was not held in some republics—it is a reflection of our present-day realities. But I must say that in the aforementioned republics too citizens did surmount the obstacles placed in their way and did express a wish to participate in deciding the country's future. Responding to this legitimate desire, the USSR Supreme Soviet set out on the path of establishing certain prerequisites for realizing it. So it happened that in Moldavia around 850,000 citizens participated in the referendum. Lithuania and Latvia each had half a million voters and Estonia had 250,000. In Abkhazia the majority participated in the referendum and voted for the preservation of the Union...

[Fesunenko] Despite the overt resistance from the republics' governments...

[Gorbachev] Not just resistance. Sometimes it took the form of heavy pressure and violence... That is what the referendum revealed. A new situation has been created as a consequence and we must now make more resolute progress toward a Union treaty; this process must be accelerated.

[Fesunenko] But what about the republics which ostentatiously refused to participate in the referendum? In your opinion, do its results mean that they have automatically obtained the right to secede from the USSR?

[Gorbachev] The fact that the aforementioned republics kept out of the referendum does not mean that they have automatically seceded from the Union. I believe that the signing of the Union treaty by republics whose people voted for the preservation of the Union will mean the start of the process for the remaining republics. We have the constitutional provisions for this, the law is in place, and the mechanism is there.

There can be no automatic secession. I think we all know why. Indeed, there exists a law which determines the mechanism for secession from the Soviet Union. Each people has the constitutional right to do this, but there are human problems. There are people of various nationalities living in all the republics. What will be their fate? It has to be resolved. They themselves must consider it and make their own choice. There are also questions of defense, property, and much else. It is a very complex process.

I said before and I want to say it now: When I think of the choice that has to be made, I come to one and the same conclusion—happiness should not be sought elsewhere. I think that those who are pushing the republics and peoples to separate from the Union are pushing them onto a dangerous path. When our multinational state is transformed, when a renewed Union of sovereign republics, a new federation, is created, when the republics and the center are strong, it will be possible to solve all problems and deal with all the acute questions that have accumulated over past years and decades.

Answering the question about the possibility of the signing of the Union Treaty in the very near future, the USSR president said: As for the mechanism for signing the treaty, it will be determined on the basis of collaboration between the republics and the Federation Council. This process has now moved on to the Union parliament and Supreme Soviets. The draft treaty is being studied in commissions. I believe it will be possible to submit it for signing sometime in April-May. At any rate, I believe it will be possible to get it initialed in the very near future, which is very important in itself.

There are people who say, though: Let us conclude an economic union. But, judging by the public mood, which was very evident at the referendum, the majority is in favor of preserving the Union as a political and economic union. The republics which sign the treaty will be building their relations within a common, unified state. While those republics that end up outside will, in time, start to form relations with the Union on a different, interstate basis and, naturally, they will then have forfeited all the advantages of internal links.

[Kravchenko] Mikhail Sergeyevich, the key question in this process is Russia's position. Particularly in relation to the elaboration and signing of the new Union treaty. At the moment we too often see the Russian leadership adopting an inconsistent, contradictory stance on fundamental questions of economics and politics. We keep on seeing confrontation with the USSR president, the government, the Supreme Soviet—and sometimes all of them together. You arrive at deadlock: Without Russia it is practically impossible to build a new Union. What is the way out of this situation, as you see it?

[Gorbachev] I believe the way out has already been found. Everything that has been mentioned is happening. Moreover, the confrontation is occurring beneath the banner of the "protection of Russian interests against diktat by the center." Incidentally, often what is mentioned is not the Union, not Union organs, but the "center," as some mythical, diabolical being that has to be fought against. Yet the center, for all its shortcomings and flaws, is now formed by the Union republics themselves, by their representatives via the supreme legislative organs. And this process will become even more democratic in the very near future, while the republics' positions will become even stronger.

Therefore, I think, the constant accusations against the center are aimed not so much at the past as the present. They conceal a scheme which demonstrates that not everyone in the Russian leadership shares the position of preserving the Union as a federation. Yet that is precisely what the people said they wanted!

Today, after the referendum, the will of the people themselves is of decisive significance for everyone, including the Russian leadership. The Russians advocated the Union—and Russia's leaders must proceed from that as the political reality. Thus the main obstacle is removed. The Union will live on. Russia's role in it at the new stage will be no less than it has been in previous decades and centuries. This is one of the characteristics of our multinational state. That is how it was formed historically.

The agenda of the Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, drawn up in preliminary form by the republic's Supreme Soviet, makes it possible to discuss the situation from positions of principle. I believe that the discussion will center on the evaluation of the political activity of the Russian leadership. That is the main thing. In certain circles and the mass media everyone is trying to reduce matters to the congress' need to resolve some kind of personality question. It seems to me that this is an oversimplification. The issue is one of a political line. The situation must be assessed, guarantees must be given that the line elaborated will be implemented consistently in the interests of the Russians and all our multinational state. This is a vital stage in the development of perestroyka. I hope that the congress' decisions will guarantee its progress.

Replying next to a question on the thesis of the so-called crisis of power and the power's lack of a clear program, the USSR president stressed that such formulations are typical of the opposition forces although a program does exist for the reform of the country's economy on the basis of a fundamentally new attitude toward ownership and the transition to a mixed economy and the market so as to include powerful incentives to labor and economic initiative. All this will have a positive effect on the social situation in the country and Soviet people's living conditions.

The political reform—which includes the formation of presidential power and the power of the Soviets, revealing their potential, and the distribution of functions between the legislature and the executive—is also deepening. A package of documents has been adopted which aims to stimulate democratic processes. As a result we are dealing with political pluralism and are moving toward a rule-of-law state. There are important processes under way in the cultural and spiritual spheres.

It must be understood: We are now switching from one set of life forms to another. This affects everything—our way of life, way of thinking, and psychological makeup. We must change ourselves and change our attitude toward one another. This is not easy in a vast state with a population of 300 million and hundreds of peoples, a country with such a dramatic history. Thus the program and thrust of the actions elaborated during perestroyka are being augmented and adjusted. But the general course is being preserved, as are its main components.

One cannot fail to see the serious tension in society connected with the situation in the market and in the economy, when economic ties are being severed and there is a real threat of a loss of work and a fall in production. All this will affect incomes, the country's budget, and the entire social situation.

People's demands and expectations are justified. In addition to the long-term plans for the reform of our society there is now a need for a concrete anticrisis program, too; we began formulating its elements at the last congress of USSR people's deputies. Economic and food agreements between republics have been formulated on the basis of its decisions. The country has embarked on a reform of the whole pricing system, including retail prices.

It is necessary to restore the economic ties severed by the processes which disrupted the normal functioning of society. The ways to resolve this problem are well known: There is an economic agreement, it must be observed and the commitments which the republics and the center adopted by mutual consent must be fulfilled. And all the bans in the republics and regions which prevent enterprises from maintaining normal economic ties must be lifted. That is the task of the Supreme Soviets and governments of the republics.

They all supported the idea that there should be a mechanism working to strengthen those ties operating

under the USSR Cabinet of Ministers on a permanent, regular basis. Such a mechanism has been created. A commission, which includes the first deputy chairmen of the republics' councils of ministers, is already at work and has found approaches which prevent a further disruption of economic ties and a decline in production. The situation here has been complicated by matters in the coal industry. However, I believe that contact with the miners is now planned and an understanding is emerging which will make it possible to halt the process of destruction. Society hopes that the country's miners realize that. In all the mining regions commissions are already at work, and at the beginning of April these questions will be examined at the Cabinet of Ministers with the participation of the authorized representatives of the mine collectives and coal-mining areas. Then there will be a similar meeting with the USSR president, too. As a result I am sure that the most acute questions will be resolved.

So the task is to restore economic ties. Then—the market. We have an action plan to increase the production of goods and tie up so-called money "to burn." The price reform must work in this direction, too. Finally, I think that there is an understanding within society that we must now subordinate all efforts to questions of the economy and its stabilization, having overcome for that purpose the passions generated by rallies. At the USSR Supreme Soviet deputies have submitted a proposal to impose a moratorium on strikes for the next few months. I welcome such a responsible attitude from the country's Supreme Soviet. I believe that all USSR citizens will support it.

We must now take the situation in hand. People have a right to expect resolute steps toward the normalization of the conflict situation in interethnic relations and the strengthening of the rule of law and law and order. Such is the anticrisis program, which I would call the "minimum program." It is already being implemented, but at the same time is being improved in the light of actual current conditions and will be presented by the prime minister to the USSR Supreme Soviet at the beginning of April.

[Fesunenko] Mikhail Sergeyevich, in 1985 you were the one who began perestroyka, you were the man who gave it its first impetus. Let us imagine you are back in 1985 again. What things would you do the same way and what would you change?

[Gorbachev] That is not an easy question. The main thing is that I would make the same choice again. After all, society could not have continued living or developed normally the way it had been living until spring 1985. Essentially, we can say that society's strength was failing. This affected the political process, the ideological sphere, spiritual and cultural development, and the economy. The most dangerous processes were in operation. The "gaps were plugged" using prices on the world oil market and by increasing resources which were on the surface and relatively easy to bring into circulation. Manpower was increased. Increase vodka production and thus raise income by 100 billion. That was how we used to live and run matters. The slightest dissent was viewed as a crime. And there were so many problems in interethnic relations!

On the whole, all of life had to be changed drastically. That is why, basically speaking, I would do it the same way again. But as for tactics, there I would first of all give thought and consideration to not abandoning the things which still work until new and more effective forms of life and mechanisms of action have been created. The divergence in approaches and inadequate synchronization of political, economic, and interethnic processes meant that we were often unprepared or lagged behind or, in other cases, got too far head. And as a result we found ourselves in a difficult situation.

Thus, on the tactical level I would try to avoid the mistakes that we made—I must say this because we are talking about very serious subjects, I do not shirk my responsibility. Everything achieved in perestroyka in the development of democratic processes, the fact that we gave people freedom, that we launched an active, peace-loving, progressive foreign policy within the framework of the new thinking—all these things are a tremendous gain. But I also see that this path could have been traveled with fewer losses. Primarily I am thinking not about myself but about the difficulties which society and our people are experiencing. I feel this deeply. For me this is the main issue. And I have no other aim than to see the cause of perestroyka thorough to the end. As for the calls to go back—I see no possibility of that. That is a mistake, a delusion. There is no going back.

It is necessary to stabilize the economy, the political process, and the situation in the country and continue the transformations and the development of all the processes within the framework of democracy. But democracy presupposes a firm power functioning effectively. Recently I was questioned by German pressmen, who wanted to put the question in these terms: Moving away from the totalitarian system involves the need to pass through a stage of authoritarianism. But that would mean a curtailment of democracy. No.

[Fesunenko] The newspapers in our country also write a lot on that theme among others! They even mention Pinochet...

[Gorbachev] I pay no attention to that. I think that society is doomed if the power is ineffective, if it is not based on firm legality and law and order. This is no longer democracy but chaos, and that is precisely what we are going through today. But the reasons are to a considerable extent not that we made the wrong choice when we began developing democratic processes. The reasons lie in the blunders that were made when reforming our federation. Here is the key. The war of laws and sovereignties introduced destructive factors, and this affected the functioning of the executive power

and thus cast doubt on the democratic processes. Everything must be done to make power effective and firm. This will also mean the preservation and continuation of the democratic transformations.

[Fesunenko] But are you then not afraid that there will again be accusations of aspiring to dictatorship? After all, recently some accused you of inconsistency and even indecision when taking certain important steps which cause disagreement in society. But on the other hand, we noted—journalists see and feel this particularly keenly—that as soon as you, as president, take firm steps within the framework of the Constitution and the law—for example, you adopt the latest decrees—then immediately people in the so-called democratic press say: "Gorbachev is moving to the right!" Incidentally, this theme is already being taken up in the West.

[Gorbachev] Yes, the only thing that you have forgotten to mention, but which I know, is that there is much talk about the president's weakness and indecisiveness. Some people really need this theme and they are trying to foster it. All these things are true. I do not say that I have no feelings or thoughts on that score or that I do not react to the situation. No. But I cannot accept the extreme views, and this fuels my confidence. We have embarked on a stage of revolutionary transformations. This is connected with the fact that people's fundamental interests are being affected. Discontent is surfacing. But I can also see that what we are doing now and will have to do in the future meets the interests of the vast mass. Ultimately the interests of everyone. So it is necessary to try, perhaps for the first time in our state's history, to carry out profound changes in the framework of democracy and achieve civic accord. Is it really a question of the "Reds" and "Whites" again? Is it really back to what happened in 1937? Or even earlier? Is it really back to saying: If you disagree with me, if you have a different viewpoint, you are my enemy? More than that: "If the enemy does not yield, he must be destroyed"?! So, are we to resolve problems that way again?

It grieves me that profound transformations cannot be achieved without losses, drama, or bloodshed. These, I believe, are the gravest moments of perestroyka. But nevertheless it has not degenerated to a civil split or confrontation between the sides. At the moment processes are taking place within democratic boundaries. We must achieve the goals which we set on a basis of accord and cooperation, even of competition between programs and means of action, vying in terms of initiative and enterprise and comparing plans and opinions. All this is normal.

We must create a political culture based on a diversity of opinions and a freedom of views on all questions which will achieve progress in society. In the final analysis let this or that social force or political party show that its programs are correct, vital, and attractive and thereby gain the people's trust, form a government, and pursue its political line. That is what is needed. But if you disagree with that political line that does not make you the enemy. We are all citizens of this country.

That is why we need a political center based on democratic values and social justice and directed toward the bulk of the people and their fundamental interests. And it must include all the best active forces both on the right and the left. It must exclude adventurists and reactionaries—on the right and the left. That is why I regard the center as a powerful popular movement. And I believe that eventually we will arrive at a political culture which will make it possible to continue resolving problems calmly, in democratic forms, and on the basis of legality—not by suppression, even less by destruction or coercion. If we are reduced to such excesses then I will consider all my work and all that I undertook to have been in vain. That would be my political demise—I hope that we will not come to that. Ultimately common sense and wisdom are strong in our people. The referendum showed that, and this inspired me.

The processes of democratization highlighted and brought new people to the fore in the years that have elapsed. Many of them, either in my immediate entourage or alongside it, entered the movement which we call "perestroyka." They are making a weighty contribution. You know, maybe we are now passing through a critical stage and the question is again being asked as it was in the past: What is happening to us, where are we, where are we going, toward what kind of society? What are we renouncing? Discussions are beginning. The situation is so tense today that we must ensure that the people in the leadership who link their fate with perestroyka are people of courage. But many people, on the contrary, want to back off, to move away...

[Fesunenko] Into science...

[Gorbachev] Into science, or better still abroad, to observe from the sidelines. The tension, the heat of discussion, and the tremendous workload are such that not everyone can bear them. Some leave not because they were traitors—it is simply that it proved too much for them. I would say that maybe with the exception of one or two people with whom I had disagreements of principle, all the rest, even those who took a different position, work and cooperate with me and render assistance. We maintain comradely relations and I meet with them regularly. Others have become advisers. The position has changed, so to speak, the situation regarding relations has changed, but I cannot say that the Gorbachev team has collapsed, that they have left or "deserted" him: The reason must be sought in the fact that maybe Gorbachev himself has changed. No, this is a natural process. New people are being drawn in and pushed forward by life. I believe that this process will increase—there are so many new forces "in the wings" in all areas. And that is good!

[Kravchenko] Mikhail Sergeyevich, there exists today a candid scenario of the disintegration of the USSR. The

disbandment of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the replacement of the existing state and political system. I am not making this up, this is all written in certain programs. The opposition is not fussy about the choice of means; rallies and the strike movement are being used. Even mine collectives have had certain critical slogans foisted upon them, they are viewed as a potential force, a powerful workers movement which can also be used for destruction. The social and economic difficulties in the country are being exploited and populism is now very often being used as a weapon. How can this pressure be resisted, is our state power not passive?

[Gorbachev] This is perhaps the most important question you have asked today. All these things are happening. You know, I do not tend to underestimate dangers although I must say that what the opposition is currently offering society contains nothing of substance that I, as president, would be prepared to adopt or which would help to resolve any questions. Apart from some individual points the opposition has no constructive program, and from that viewpoint it cannot compete with us.

Where is the danger? It is that the opposition wants to exploit the acute situation in the country, the social tension, the difficulties in the consumer market and in work in order to incite the people to take actions with unpredictable consequences. This is the gravest danger. The opposition has every opportunity at congresses and in supreme soviets to set out its arguments, present its case, and address the people. A considerable part of our press, if not the bulk of it, is at the disposal of the opposition forces. In any event, there are dozens or hundreds of newspapers in which they can set out their viewpoint.

But as I have already said, this viewpoint of theirs does not provide the answers, it does not offer a way out of the situation. Therefore they, seeing the hopelessness of it, resort to other actions. It must be stated bluntly that in those places where opposition forces have been in power they have shown that they do not have the necessary competence or ability to manage processes. Rallies, slogans, and vicious phrases are one thing, organizing society's life is another, especially at the vital stage where we now are. A stage in which it is necessary to resolve the urgent tasks of the day and at the same time create the preconditions for society's renewal and advance it along the path of reform. Since they are not succeeding in either matter—neither offering society a program which it would adopt nor proving their ability to make effective use of the power which they gained in many places—all this is making them rush. People can see this.

The opposition is trying to take advantage of the fact that the situation is tense in order to egg people on. They have clearly taken the path of incitement and are trying to embroil the working class in this, also by exploiting our mistakes and the fact that some problems remain unresolved. But you cannot treat society that way, especially when it is at such a crucial stage. This shows people once more just whom they are dealing with.

We are doing everything today in the framework of the anticrisis program and will increase our efforts. I am confident that people will remain composed and will not yield to these inflammatory calls, and that the authorities will not permit chaos to flare up here. Ultimately the forces which are inciting and provoking disorders and want to go against the Constitution will have to deal with those who stand guard over constitutional order.

I am sure of our vast potential. Soviet people understand that now, more than ever before, it is necessary to show restraint and, moving toward the solution of concrete tasks, get out of the crisis. We call for civic accord and constructive cooperation in the fatherland's interests and we appeal to our people's patriotism.

Today I met with representatives of the country's agrarian sector. These are the people who have embarked on new forms of work and achieved interesting results. They described their work, said that they lacked this, that, and the other, and appealed to the working class, to the miners: Is it really possible to succumb to dangerous inflammatory appeals when such responsible tasks face us.

Metallurgical plants are stopping work, the machine-building sector is not receiving metal. The other day the director of the Novolipetsk Metallurgical Combine went on television and spoke about the anxious situation. Representatives from Azerbaijan add: But we get metal from that combine and produce equipment for the oil industry; if the oilmen do not get the equipment it will hit oil extraction, too. It is a chain reaction.

There are many problems, everyone nowadays can make justified demands. But we can satisfy them if, using the transition to new forms of economic management, we increase the results of our activity, if we create a base which enables us to resolve production and social problems, support defense, and so forth. Thus it is necessary to follow the chosen course. And to do so firmly and with composure. And of course the country's leadership, at which much criticism is leveled, needs the people's understanding and support.

[Fesunenko] Mikhail Sergeyevich, speaking about the crisis situation I would venture to point out that our hottest spot today is surely Moscow. This is where you get the sharpest demarcation between different political forces, the loudest opposition, so to speak, the most powerful mass rallies and, perhaps, the emptiest shelves in the stores, and this also fuels the fire. Moscow City Soviet, on the one hand, is demonstrating an increasing opposition to the center, while on the other hand life in the city is becoming increasingly disordered. Take the recent confrontation on the issue of the rallies planned for 28 March. The Supreme Soviet cancels it, Moscow City Soviet, on the contrary, ostentatiously permits it. Then the prime minister, the Cabinet of Ministers, and

the president intervene. I can imagine how people abroad must see us. Of course, this is not the most important thing, but in principle, from the standpoint of normal logic, it is all a nonsense, a paradox. It would help to find a way out of the situation, I think, if Moscow were given special status, which the USSR Supreme Soviet will surely consider. How do you view the political deadlock in Moscow and how can a way out of it be found?

[Gorbachev] You are right in your assessment of the situation in the capital. I do not want to be sidetracked first by what the opposition forces in power in Moscow are doing. That is a separate question.

But the situation in Moscow does concern us. To maintain a certain living standard for Moscow's citizens and then improve it, the prime minister and the Cabinet of Ministers recently examined these questions and then adopted a decision. I have to say that we are keeping all questions of Moscow's supplies under control. That is one of the important problems today. If I had known what questions you had prepared for me, I would could have brought the relevant statistics along with me. In many respects Moscow has received just as much as in past years—and in the past two months virtually the same quantity of meat. But the situation in the market is such that everything which appears in the stores is snapped up. There is quite a lot of work to be done to set the Moscow market on a normal track. I think that we must act together with the Moscow authorities here and go to them for help. I have in mind the Russian leadership and the Union leadership.

I hope that the oblasts and republics supplying Moscow with produce will behave with due responsibility. Especially since Muscovites in general work well, they must be complimented. Despite all the complexities they are fulfilling and even overfulfilling the plans and are near to supplying in full the output that the country expects from them. They are entitled to expect that the country will also be attentive to their needs. The vast city needs the concern of the center, and we must surely make even greater efforts to give Muscovites the corresponding help.

That is the main thing. We hope that working Moscow will show restraint and organization and will not yield to all these attempts to embroil it in any political battles. After all, in general, despite all its efforts, the opposition is not succeeding in leading working Moscow along behind it.

As for the political moods in Moscow, they are also influenced by the fact that perestroyka impinges on many strata connected with the reform of the defense complex and defense-related science and affects other detachments of the scientific and technical intelligentsia here. Complex processes are taking place among all these vast groups of the population. This surely also fuels the discontent and the actions of certain people. And although they sometimes demonstrate, in our view, excessive harshness, in their opinion this is a justified reaction to the situation in the country.

It seems to me that the whole complex of problems will be resolved in Moscow within the framework of the reform processes, and in addition we must speed up the completion of the process of elaborating and adopting a law on the status of Moscow as the capital of the Union and the Russian Federation. Much work has been done but viewpoints have differed here.

As for the rally, Moscow has simply become hostage to the political confrontation in the country. For my own part I would say that the USSR Supreme Soviet, where this theme was raised on the initiative of deputies, acted correctly. Now when we are resolving major socioeconomic problems, when the Union parliament is working and adopting important decisions, and when the attention of the Congress of Russian People's deputies will be focused on the fundamental questions of the life of the republic and, thus, of Moscow, one must not create in the capital an atmosphere which would prevent all these constitutional organs from functioning normally and seeking correct decisions based on a comparison of viewpoints.

That is why I delegated certain powers to the Cabinet of Ministers to protect all our constitutional organs from rally mania and pressure on deputies for this period. What kind of democracy is this? People must consider everything thoroughly and take a firm stand. The Cabinet of Ministers, implementing resolutions of the Supreme Soviet and my instructions, considered it necessary to adopt the corresponding decisions and they were published. The government plans to issue an appeal to Muscovites to stay calm, not to yield to inflammatory slogans, to continue working, and to resolve practical questions. That is the most important thing now. And to rely on the constitutional organs. I believe that this is how it should be.

[Kravchenko] Recently in particular you have been under a tremendous burden—nervous, psychological, and intellectual. I would like to ask: How do you feel, where do you get fresh strength from?

[Gorbachev] I was asked that question when visiting Finland. I want to repeat what I said then. First and foremost I am grateful to my parents—peasants who gave me a definite foundation—and the peasant life which taught me to keep up my spirits, preserve my composure and common sense, and not lose my head. I am also grateful to my wife, Raisa Maksimovna, who takes great care of me because she understands the burden of responsibility that I bear. And most important—my faith in the correctness of the cause and in the choice which I have made. Because if your faith is destroyed, nothing can save you. So long as a man is strong in spirit, so long as he keeps his faith in what he is doing, he will continue to feel good and his work will be productive. In my opinion this is true of everyone, and I am no exception.

Counterintelligence Chief on Security Threat

LD3003172191 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] The Soviet counterintelligence chief, Gennadiy Titov, warns that the country is faced with the worst ever threat to its security since World War II. Interviewed in the press, the counterintelligence chief has said that that threat, although it has been warmed up from abroad, had domestic roots. Nationalism has led to bloodshed and heavy loss of life in Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia. In the time of peace hundreds of thousands of refugees have had to abandon their homes. The economy is in chaos and new ties are still nonexistent, and they simply can not emerge over night. The standard of living has been declining.

Gennadiy Titov said the worst situations were in the Urals, Kuznetsk, and Donets coalfields, West Siberia, Moscow, and Leningrad—that is, areas of heavy industry and natural resources.

Liberal Democratic Party Leader on Platform

LD3003042891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1550 GMT 29 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Igor Agabekov]

[Text] Moscow, 29 Mar (TASS)—The Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) of the Soviet Union is coming out in favor of the preservation of the territorial integrity of the USSR within its current boundaries. Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, its leader, stated this at a news conference today organized by the party's higher council in accordance with the forthcoming second congress of the LDP.

He reported that the LDP supports the signing of the Union treaty but it will attempt to achieve profound political and economic reforms.

Touching on relations between the LDP and the CPSU, Vladimir Zhirinovskiy said his party—while recognizing the errors of the CPSU and not agreeing with communist dogmas—had a respectful attitude toward it as the ruling party. He explained his position by the fact the LDP intended itself to become the ruling party in the future and did not wish that any other party which might occupy positions different from the LDP should undergo persecution.

Answering a question about the attitude of the LDP to the rally organized in Moscow yesterday by the "Democratic Russia" movement and toward this movement as a whole, the party leader condemned the actions of the leadership of this organization, which despite the decision of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers called on people to go out on a demonstration [manifestatsiya] and in so doing enter into confrontation with the authorities. The use of law and order bodies to prevent possible disorders, according to Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, was "a normal response reaction by the center to the actions of 'Democratic Russia.'"

Having expressed a negative attitude toward the democrats, the LDP leader said that while his party was coming out in favor of the integrity of the Soviet state, the democrats wished to separate the Union along national lines.

At the same time, he criticized the foreign policy of the current leadership of the country, stating that because of its lack of foresight the Soviet Union was losing influence in the world arena and in various regions of the world. Vladimir Zhirinovskiy came out in favor of "a division of the world into spheres of influence between the USSR, the United States, Europe, and Japan."

The leader of the LDP came out against the election of presidents in the Union republics, stating however that if presidential elections were to take place in Russia, the LDP would take part in them and put forward its own candidate.

TV Program Views Internal Problems, U.S. Ties

LD3003215191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1440 GMT 30 Mar 91

[From the "International Panorama" program, hosted by Vitaliy Kobysh]

[Text] [Kobysh] Hello, comrades. I shall begin "International Panorama" with the events that are most important by virtue of their dramatic nature and variety. They are taking place in the Soviet Union. Moreover, their epicenter in the last few days, especially on Thursday, has been Moscow. Everything on that day was confusingly intermingled—human pain, desperation and protest, and the political capital that has been made of them, inebriation with unaccustomed freedom: under democracy anything goes, and the over-zealous, though I believe entirely sincere, desire to protect the young democracy and the demonstrators themselves. Thank God, the danger passed. This is how we learn democracy. But this lesson in democracy was harsh and unjustifiably dangerous. Much is still ahead of us. The most important thing, beyond all doubt, is the need to get an agreement with the miners urgently and without delay. It's not easy. The treasury is empty. But even if it means incurring new debts, we are going to have to find ways to meet the economic demands of these people, who are engaged in infernal labor. Yes, after the miners, the steelmen and workers of other branches of the economy could go on strike. Yet, certainly the main problem now is the miners. Much time has been lost.

Here too, the politickers are already dancing, and it's a very dangerous dance, as the miners themselves seem to be beginning to realize. Of course, they're not on strike for the fun of it, or because they have a good life, although they are aware at the same time that a good life can't be created overnight, either for them or for others. Surely we should be talking with them at the highest level, having done everything possible to make their life and labor easier. They would fully appreciate that. Then, in all probability, the country would not find itself faced

with the economic abyss which so clearly gapes in front of it now. I take it that as far as priorities and the necessity of urgent solution go, this problem comes before any other, including our international problems.

How is all this reflected in the Soviet Union's international standing? Badly. Badly, of course. Because any international policy begins at home. We are not only being criticized, which is fair enough, but also lectured and even threatened, and that's not normal at all. This refers to the United States, to certain American departments, yes, and to some of the media recently. It has already been reported, for example, that the American TIME magazine has published a sensational article. After the operation Desert Storm was carried out, TIME published a report titled "Shield in the Steppes" to the effect that if civil war broke out in the Soviet Union, U.S. and perhaps not just U.S. Armed Forces must be ready to carry out another military operation, this time on the territory of the Soviet Union. Quite a bold notion! Until recently, the media in the United States would not have allowed themselves to say such a thing. Now, as you see, they do. But I must say that on the whole the authorities in Washington are comporting themselves fairly correctly, on the basis that however hard our internal problems may be, they are transitory, while the preservation of the Soviet-American accord on the fundamental problems of human life is a long-term matter, aimed at centuries to come.

Economic

Gorbachev Sends Letter to Republics on Pricing

LD3103140991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1300 GMT 31 Mar 91

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev sent a letter to the leaders of the republics regarding prices. It says that in a number of regions contract prices are being used for certain goods, the level of which is higher than state retail prices envisaged for those goods by the agreement between the USSR and the republics on the question of the reform of retail prices and the social protection of the population. The president asks that in the interests of consumers new prices be set for the goods indicated.

Gorbachev Letter Viewed

LD0104074191 Moscow TASS in English 2151 GMT 31 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev sent a letter to the leaders of Supreme Soviets and governments of Union and autonomous republics, calling their attention to the fact that some Soviet regions use contractual prices for some goods, the level of which is higher than state retail prices.

In the interests of consumers, the president requests to set new prices for the above goods in compliance with the provisions of the agreement on ceiling levels to raise state retail prices.

The president's letter deals with a very important issue for the population.

The so-called contractual prices on staple foodstuffs and many non-edible goods are now widely practiced in the country. The reason for this is a wrong understanding of the transition to market relations.

Local authorities also played a negative role in this respect.

They began buying up goods in neighbouring regions at rigged-up prices, instead of painstaking work to saturate markets with their own supplies.

Ordinary people have to pay for this short-sighted policy. Prices for meat, fish, eggs and many other staple foods jumped up, and prices in dining-rooms also increased.

The introduction of contractual prices for staple foodstuffs runs counter to the principles of the price policy agreed with republics. The agreement between the Soviet Union and republics stipulates that staple foods will be sold at fixed state retail prices.

Ceiling levels for all commodity groups were set, and prices for them may not go above these levels.

In its decision, the Soviet parliament made it incumbent upon the Soviet Government to stiffen control over the observance of price regulations and to exact excessive revenues from enterprises, organisations and local authorities received from the selling of goods at prices exceeding agreed levels.

Price-forming bodies, which received legal grounds for resolute actions, should ensure order with retail prices and protect the interests of citizens. However, they will not fulfill this task without support from population.

For this purpose, the population should know its rights. Each shop should display a list of goods sold at fixed retail prices.

Local authorities and consumers' societies should participate in this work in order to end anarchy with prices and to begin to advance to a civilised market economy.

State Bank Introduces Foreign Currency Rules

LD0104161491 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—In compliance with the Soviet law on currency regulation, the Soviet State Bank introduces, from April 2, 1991, new rules on purchases and sales (transfer) of foreign currencies for their export abroad from personal resources of citizens.

The rules stipulate that commercial banks, having appropriate licences, will sell currencies to citizens and buy them at current exchange rates at the currency exchange of the Soviet State Bank.

At tenders held today, April 1, the U.S. dollar's exchange rate against the rouble was one U.S. dollar = 27.6 roubles.

The bank establishes the following order of selling currencies to citizens permanently living in the USSR:

1. Citizens, going abroad for personal reasons (holidays, medical treatment, tourist trips, to visit relatives living abroad, to visit burial places of relatives, etc.) with the ordinary foreign passport, may purchase foreign currencies at authorised banks to a sum equal to 200 U.S. dollars, once in a calendar year.

2. When citizens emigrate for permanent residence abroad, they may purchase a sum equivalent to 100 U.S. dollars for each emigrant on the basis of a document certifying emigration from the USSR.

Quotas of selling currency to citizens will be adjusted by the Soviet State Bank, depending on the state of the domestic currency market.

Currency from the currency accounts of enterprises for business trips will be paid as usual.

Economist Calls for 'Harsh' Economic Measures

LD1903225991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1635 GMT 19 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Lev Aksenov and Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow, 19 March. (TASS)—"There is no need to break anything in the Russian economy, all manufacturers must be given equal chances; and freedom of entrepeneurial activity, coupled with the observation of strict discipline, must be provided for all subjects. This is the position of Mikhail Bocharov, head of the Supreme Economic Council of Russia's parliament and a USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputy.

The difficult socioeconomic position in Russia provokes many economists to propose their own way out of the crisis. Mikhail Bocharov has also not remained on the sidelines. "The laws adopted by the supreme soviets are not working. Judging from everything, in the present conditions the only way of directing things is by means of decrees and edicts which aim to establish a market which functions normally," he elaborated in a discussion with some TASS correspondents. "I understand that measures of this nature could be unpopular and could be interpreted as being a return to the command-administrative system, but there is no other way out."

Unfortunately, noted Mikhail Bocharov, we are still unable to rid ourselves of the usual stereotype of sharing what we possess. "It is not possible to establish a market economy in such a way; an efficient system for creating equal conditions for free competition is essential." It is the view of the interviewee that one possible alternative is to let the collectives of industrial enterprises acquire land and property.

Mikhail Bocharov contends that the main shortcoming of our economic system is the absence of strict executive discipline. This confirmed supporter of democratic views in politics, an active figure in the interregional group of deputies, is sure that only harsh methods of leadership—a sort of return to certain elements of the administrative command system—can give positive results in the current difficult economic conditions. The issues of revitalizing the financial situation in Russia also occupy a prominent position in his ideas.

The concrete measures worked out by the leaders of the Supreme Economic Council are based on a five-year period. He intends to present them to the Russian parliament and government in the near future.

Kuzbass Mine Strikes, Talks With Leaders Viewed

LD2903192591

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 1145 GMT on 29 March broadcasts a 10-minute report by correspondent Yuriy Kopylov in Kemerovo. Kopylov reports that workers' committees coordinate and control the situation. He says that "according to the data I received at the workers' committees in the Kuzbass, up to this moment 69 mining collectives are on strike, and not 50, as was reported today by All-Union Radio. Moreover, it does not mean that all of them are not working. Only 40 mines are fully idle. Six mines are working without shipment to consumers. On the decision of town workers' committees, nine mines are working and extracting coal for the energy needs of the towns. They are also regarded as being on strike. On the whole the situation is changing all the time, and even during the day."

Giving the reasons that caused the strike, Kopylov mentions the unwillingness of the Union government to hold negotiations with the miners, events in Lithuania, attacks on Yeltsin, a worsening situation in the consumer market, and the collapse of Resolution No. 608. He says that a meeting between Gorbachev and the miners took place in Moscow on 19 March, but adds that "I found out here, in Kemerovo, that Amar Tuleyev, chairman of the oblast soviet, took convenient people to this meeting, and not those who had been delegated by the workers' committees. This certainly caused stormy indignation among the miners. Rumors in the town have it that yet another meeting with the president of the country will take place."

During the recent visit to the Kuzbass, Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev, due to the arrangement made by the local authorities, failed to meet representatives of the workers' committees. So he invited the miners to come and see him in Moscow. Kopylov says that "this meeting took place in Moscow the other day and, according to

our data, mutual understanding has been reached on many issues that were discussed there."

Kuzbass Situation Updated

LD3103131191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 31 Mar 91

[Text] Now on the continuing miners' strikes: According to information provided by the city strike committee in Novokuznetsk at 1300, three mines and two mine-tunnelling directorates are not working at all in the town. Five pits are working without loading coal for consumers.

A similar situation has arisen in other cities of Kuzbass. In Prokopyevsk eight pits and two truck depots that transport coal from the open cast mines are on strike. Five pits are idle in Mezhdurechinsk. One mine-building directorate and one directorate that installs mining equipment are also not working.

At the same time, a decision has been made by the towns' workers' committees that one pit is working in Novokuznetsk and one in Prokopyevsk, and also two open cast mines in Mezhdurechinsk are in operation to supply the population of the towns and cities of Kuzbass with heat.

Radios Report Conflicting Data

LD2903184191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1600 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Text] Special demands are now put on journalists. What is needed is accuracy and honesty of the information they report, especially when miners are in question.

This is what happened today. Radio Rossii reported today on the situation in Kuzbass. In particular, it refuted the information given by Radio Mayak on the number of enterprises on strike. A Radio Rossii reporter gave a different, a much higher figure in a live telephone report. Vladimir Yuryev, our own reporter in Kemerov Oblast, reports that the information given in news bulletins on Mayak, and in the latest news bulletins on All-Union Radio, undergoes a treble checking at the Kemerov Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies—first at the executive committees of the towns and cities, then at the production associations which extract coal, and finally, directly at the pits and open cast mines.

In particular, as was revealed today at the oblast soviet of people's deputies, 38 mines out of 101 coal-extracting enterprises in the oblast, and three pit-tunnelling directorates, were not working.

By the way, the information given by Radio Rossii on support by railway workers for the situation that has arisen does not correspond to the facts. This is what our reporter was told at the Kemerov Railway Board:

[Unidentified reporter] For the first time in the history of the Kuzbass, railway workers have been formed to send away from here empty railcars set aside to be loaded with coal. As a result of the decline in output, the miners are 1.6 million tonnes in debt since the start of the strike. Nevertheless, the tension will not lessen, even if all the coal extracting enterprises start working immediately. There are only enough railcars to last two to three days at the most, after which the trains will have reach consumers, unload there, and then return back. This will take five-six days. This will force the stoppage of the coal production again for some time.

Today 8,000 open railcars are standing idle on the railway tracks. Will they also have to be sent away empty from Kuzbass, and by this inflict losses that amount to millions to the country—ask the railway workers.

Military

Reports Follow 29 Mar All-Army Party Conference

'Bewilderment' Seen Over Role

LD2903222791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Video report by correspondent S. Lomakin at the All-Army Party Conference in Moscow on 29 March, including recorded interviews with participants Colonel B.I. Chystiakov, Captain N.N. Gerasimov, and Colonel N.V. Kotseruba; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Lomakin] A thousand delegates from the more than 1 million Army and Navy communists are attending the conference. This is an imposing force, which has to be reckoned with. That is the view of the party conference participants themselves. It is no secret, either, that the Army has recently become not only the target of fierce criticism—to use a legislative phrase—but also the the object of well-concealed interest from the opposition, aimed at politicizing the Army, clearing the way for other parties, and seizing a leading position in the Armed Forces command.

No secret was made at the conference of the fact that bewilderment had arisen inside the Army itself. All too frequently, because of someone's carelessness or short-sightedness, the military are made scapegoats. Service in the Armed Forces is losing its prestige. In past years, and this year, the Army call-up has practically been thwarted. An overtly hostile attitude to the boys in military uniform is on the increase in the national republics. That is already well known. But there is also something new. An enemy image in the shape of the man with the gun is being created in some places. It is frequently forgotten, at the same time, that today perhaps only the Army and Navy remain the buttress and pivot of the state. If the Armed Forces are destroyed and fragmented into individual republics and regions, there will be no state and no fatherland.

There was also the main thing that caused heated arguments among delegates in the corridors—the threat of a drop in the defense capability of the Armed Forces.

Sober and sensible views were voiced that now the Warsaw Pact has been disbanded, we have ended up facing the mighty NATO military bloc, alone and it is no longer possible today to lull ourselves with talk of our complete safety. [Chistyakov] Attempts are now being made to make the Army into an instrument of political struggle, and everyone is trying to bring it onto their side. That is why we have all the consequences that stem from that.

[Lomakin] I am interested above all in the Baltic republics. How is the Army going to act if the republics make a definitive break with the Union?

[Gerasimov] The Army is an instrument of the Union Government, and we will evidently be carrying out the orders of the Union Government. But I do not think it will be an order to mount further confrontation with our people.

[Kotseruba] For as long as we are there, we will be defending the interests of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

[Lomakin] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, USSR president, is taking part in the conference proceedings. The conference will continue tomorrow.

Shlyaga, Yazov Address Talks

LD2903182391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1658 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 29 Mar (TASS)—The first All-Army Party Conference opened here today. With its holding the process of the transformation of Army and Navy party structures, which is being implemented within the framework of the party-wide course toward separating the functions of state and party bodies, is being completed.

In the report by the head of the Main Political Directorate of the USSR Armed Forces Colonel General Nikolay Shlyaga, and in the delegates' addresses, it was stressed that the Army's communists cannot but be alarmed at the ideological and political opponents of the CPSU increasing their activity in shaping a negative attitude toward the Army and Navy in society. Army party organizations are now working in new conditions. Their main method is strength of conviction, knowledge of the masses, and ability to persuade them. Everything connected with the social and legal protection of servicemen and the members of their families should merit party members' close attention. Party concern about strengthening the combined command [yedinonachaliye] remains current. Enhancing the role of democratic institutions in the Armed Forces is a matter of great importance for party organizations. Army organizations must search for and maintain relations of partnership and cooperation with those sociopolitical forces that stand for socialist choice and strengthening the policies of the USSR Supreme Soviet and president in the country's defense and security.

The conference was addressed by Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Yazov, member of the Security Council and USSR defense minister. Taking part in the work of the party conference is USSR President and General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, members of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee, and the secretaries of the central committees of the communist parties of the Union republics.

Officials Elected

LD3003195191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1523 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar (TASS)—Current problems to do with the life and activity of the party organizations of the USSR Armed Forces were at the center of attention at the first all-army party conference which concluded here today. During the debates, delegates stressed that communists in the army and navy back the further intensification of perestroyka, the strengthening of the USSR as a single federative socialist state, and the immediate signing of a Union treaty.

The party organizations of the USSR Armed Forces view as amongst their most important duties the maintenance of the country's defense capacity at a level of reasonable sufficiency, the organized pursuit of military reform, the preservation of the USSR's united Armed Forces, and their maintenance at a high level of combat and mobilization readiness. That is why the main task of all the communists in the Army and Navy at the present stage, it was stressed in the speeches, is the ideological rallying together of party ranks, active and purposeful work for the implementation of the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress and of the highest party organs, the protection of the USSR Constitution, and the realization of the policies of the legislature, government, and USSR president in the field of defense.

Delegates listened with much attention to a speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, USSR president and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Elections to an all-army party committee and control commission were held. Major General Mikhail Surkov was elected secretary of the all-Union party committee, and Major General Petr Grigoryev was elected chairman of the control commission.

Gorbachev Gives Speech

LD3003170191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1400 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] The first all-Army party conference continued in Moscow today. Delegates who contributed to the debates

comprehensively discussed current problems regarding the life and activity of the party organizations of the USSR Armed Forces. They stressed that communists in the Army and Navy back the further intensification of perestroyka, the strengthening of the USSR as a single federative socialist state, and the immediate signing of a Union treaty. The party organizations of the USSR Armed Forces view among their most important duties the maintenance of the country's defense capacity at a level of reasonable sufficiency, the organized pursuit of military reform, the preservation of the USSR's united armed forces, and their maintenance at a high level of combat and mobilization readiness. Delegates listened with much attention to a speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, USSR president and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Elections to an all-Army party committee and control commission were held. The first all-Army party conference ended its proceedings.

Conference Ends

LD3003140891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1200 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] A few moments ago the first all-Army party conference in the history of our Armed Forces ended its work at the Central Academic Theater of the Soviet Army. It determined the current situation and measures for the ideological unity of the communists of units, ships, institutions, and establishments of the Defense Ministry. A provision for a control commission of Armed forces' party organizations was approved and an all-Army party committee and control commission of CPSU organizations in the Army and the Navy were elected. The all-Army party conference has concluded the process of transformations in the CPSU Armed Forces organizations.

Baltic Republics

Baltic Military District Party Conference Held

PM2603145191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Mar 91 First Edition p 2

[Colonel M. Ziyeminsh report under the rubric "Party Conferences" and the general heading "Following the Process of Renewal"]

[Text] The theme of cooperation with public associations and organizations and with movements in support of the socialist choice in the fight against separatism in the Baltic region was aired extensively at the Baltic Military District party conference. The report delivered by Colonel N. Redko, chairman of the organizational committee, and the speeches made by Colonel General F. Kuzmin, commander of the district troops, Colonel V. Kostin, Lieutenant Colonel A. Sankov, and other delegates, all stressed the need for active joint work in the military-patriotic education of the population, and primarily of young people.

Army General V. Varennikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, and M. Burokevicius, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, participated in the work of the conference and gave addresses.

Estonia, Moldova Sign Cooperation Agreement

LD3003205191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1400 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] Kishinev, 30 Mar (TASS)—A treaty on cooperation between the internal ministries of Moldova and Estonia was signed here on Friday. Olev Laanjarv, minister of internal affairs of Estonia, told the correspondents of MOLDOVA-PRESS news agency that "the treaty signed will unite the joint efforts not only in resolving the urgent tasks—curbing crime and violations of economic law—but also in achieving a real and not just a declared sovereignty of Estonia and Moldova".

Ion Koshtash, minister of internal affairs of Moldova, referred to the passing of the laws on police and to the withdrawal of Estonia from the Union ministry subordination as concrete steps on the way toward the establishment of a true independence of the republics. He suggested that the president of the Moldovan Republic should also transfer the internal affairs administration of the republic to the jurisdiction of the Government and the Supreme Soviet of Moldova.

The Internal Ministry of Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic, the minister said, has already concluded a similar treaty on cooperation with the Internal Ministry of the Russian Federation. At the moment, talks are being held on signing such treaties with the internal ministries of the Ukraine and Belorussia.

Bush Receives Estonian President in Washington

LD2903205391 Moscow TASS in English 2009 GMT 29 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Pavel Vanichkin]

[Text] Washington March 29 TASS—U.S. President George Bush received Estonian President Arnold Ruutel in the White House today.

Ruutel is in the United States on a private visit. Followed a meeting with Bush, Ruutel briefed journalists that "the talk focused mostly on the need to start real negotiations between Moscow and the Baltic republics" and that "George Bush voiced concern about the search for a solution to the Baltic crisis".

A White House spokesman recalled that U.S. President "had already had five meetings with leaders of the Baltic republics" since last May.

Lithuanian Talks With USSR To Resume 4 April

LD3003154891 Moscow TASS in English 1405 GMT 30 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazys Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius March 30 TASS—A telegram has been received here from Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, USSR first deputy prime minister, who heads the Soviet Union's delegation to the talks with a Lithuanian delegation. He suggested resuming the talks without delay, without preconditions.

It is suggested in the telegram that the talks be resumed in Moscow on April 4 or 5. In addition, it is suggested that a preliminary meeting of working groups one or two days prior to an officially agreed upon date be arranged if the Lithuanian side considers it necessary.

Lithuanian parliament President Vytaytas Landsbergis, in a reply telegram to Doguzhiyev, expressed satisfaction with the suggestion concerning the talks and expressed a wish that a preliminary meeting of the working groups be arranged in Moscow on April 3 at the permanent mission of the Lithuanian government.

Landsbergis consented to the holding of the first meeting of the state delegations to the talks in Moscow on April 4 at the place and time suggested by the Soviet side.

MVD Official Sends Message to Lithuanian Premier

LD2903234891 Vilnius International Service in English 2300 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Text] The Lithuanian premier, Gedimanas Vagnorius, received a telegram from chief of the northwestern and Baltic interior troops, Lieutenant General (Savin). The high-ranking Soviet military official claims that an agreement was reached during a conference held between the Soviet interior minister and his Baltic counterparts to

the effect that this spring, youths who were not conscripted during the autumn call-up would be drafted for service in the Soviet Army.

Lt Gen (Savin) also proposes to restore the earlier order, where the guarding of prisoners and the accused in court was effected by Soviet interior troops. The parliament's press representative said at a briefing this morning that as of 1 January this year, the Soviet interior troops had refused to perform this function, and it was now assumed by the Lithuanian police. The Lithuanian Government's Information Bureau today circulated a statement refuting the facts stated in Lieutenant General (Savin's) telegram. Lithuania's representative, who attended the above conference of interior ministers, was there as observer, and did not sign any agreement on behalf of the Republic. Meanwhile, the issue of the guarding of prisoners should be first discussed by the working groups of the two countries' interior ministries, and only then during the inter-state talks. The proposal by Lieutenant General (Savin) is one-sided and unacceptable, the statement says.

Lithuania To Increase Oil Production

LD2903121191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Text] The government has passed a decision on the production and industrial exploitation of oil in Lithuania.

Premier Gediminas Vagnorius has noted that this work has been delayed because of negligence by the former government. It must be substantially stepped up.

The Ministry of Power Engineering, together with the geological service, have been instructed to draw up by the middle of May a program of oil production in Lithuania and submit it to the government. The marginal exploitation of oil deposits in western Lithuania started last spring during the Soviet blockade.

Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party Theses

PM0104131491 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 16 Mar 91 p 3

[Interview with Gediminas Kirkilas, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party, by Rostislav Osherov, date and place not given; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction: "From Words to Action"]

[Text] Something of which we have never experienced a shortage is all kinds of slogans and statements—which are promising but fail to materialize. Little has changed in this respect despite the stormy political processes that began with the proclamation of perestroyka. Rather the reverse. Various political parties with attractive programs have not as yet brought us a step closer to their declared aims. That is why the people are developing a firmly skeptical attitude toward these parties' activity—activity that does not usually go beyond talk.

Of late the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party [LDLP], advocating political and economic realism, has drawn attention to itself by its statements. TIESA recently published the LDLP council theses—a kind of political doctrine for the party. Is the party's activity just confined to adopting theses; what concrete substance is there behind these words that objectively reflect the situation in Lithuania? We put these questions to Gediminas Kirkilas, deputy chairman of the LDLP.

[Osherov] One of the theses talks about the delay in resolving the problems experienced by the republic's non-Lithuanian population...

[Kirkilas] We suggested our solutions to the problem of interethnic relations last summer. Many Sajudis leaders were too rigid, proceeding on purely populist ideas and taking a narrow-minded attitude to national questions. It is quite futile to delve into history, extracting past grievances from it. You have to decide to make mutual concessions in the light of present-day realities, on the basis of universally recognized international norms.

Our program on Southeast Lithuania will be published next week. A special commission headed by C. Jursenas is working in close contact with the Union of Polish Scientists and with the Department for Nationalities' Affairs. Our deputies at the Supreme Soviet are trying to influence the parliament. Party representatives are meeting with the population in rayons and humanitarian and cultural programs have been planned, along with aid in resolving acute social problems. We invite other parties—the "Greens" and Social Democrats—to cooperate. Educational work is also necessary—many people are simply not aware of what is happening in the republic: They get everything from the biased local press or from rumor. Hence the fear and mistrust. Even if there are sensible decisions it will take some time for the concern to die down—concern generated by the actions of those people who played the national card.

[Osherov] When reading the theses, one is conscious of the LDLP's anxiety over the future of democratic processes in Lithuania. Obviously that is why, in order to consolidate and develop what the party has achieved, the party is proposing to encourage the multiparty system and create favorable conditions for the activity of democratically oriented parties and the formation of a consultative council at the republic's Supreme Soviet, involving representatives of all political parties and organizations and specialists from various sectors.

[Kirkilas] The LDLP sets itself three highly important tasks: a concept for the restoration of statehood, a treaty with the USSR, and the adoption of a draft constitution. What kind of state are we building? An independent democratic Lithuania is too vague, the parliament working from law to law without a clear line. A concept for the restoration of statehood is necessary, which we will submit at the end of March—a concrete action plan. Our immediate task is to prepare a treaty with the Soviet Union and make provision for all fundamental elements:

the status of the army, the fate of union enterprises, and the rights of national minorities. We must show the Union that we understand the geopolitical realities of our situation. An economic agreement must be signed with the USSR for this year at whatever cost. Since the leadership is unjustifiably dragging its heels in resolving these issues, we must prepare the drafts and submit them for consideration in parliament.

Our constitution should define the kind of state that we are building. Our party is ready to put forward its own draft constitution for a parliamentary republic this month—drafted by the commission chaired by J. Bulavas—which is, in our view, most suitable at the stage of transition from totalitarianism to democracy. As far as I am aware, the radicals are preparing a draft presidential constitution. We think that only a referendum can resolve this question.

A consultative council, including scientists, particularly economists and lawyers, is needed to ensure that the parliament's activity is more productive. We are not saying anything new here, many countries have similar organs, but we really need one: It is no secret that many deputies are amateurs when it comes to economic and legal questions, and this also takes its toll on the decisions that they adopt.

I would like to point out that, as long as we lack a parliamentary majority and, consequently, broad opportunities to implement our plans, one of our main areas of activity today is to propagandize the party's positions via the press and meetings with the population. I think that our ideas will meet with support from Lithuania's inhabitants.

Lithuanian Nuclear Project's Future Discussed

PM2703093791 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 16 Mar 91 p 1

[ELTA report: "On the Ignalina AES and Snieckus Settlement"]

[Text] Vilnius, 14 Mar—Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius received Vitaliy Konovalov, USSR minister of atomic power engineering and industry, today.

During the conversation they discussed the future of the third power unit at the Ignalina nuclear electric power station [AES]. The USSR Government has prepared appropriate documents on the construction of this unit. It has been agreed that the Lithuanian Government will adopt a final decision on the unit in the near future. During the meeting they also discussed the registration and staffing of enterprises in Snieckus based on Lithuanian republic law, payments from these installations into the Lithuanian budget, and budgetary funding for the settlement. An accord was reached on fixing prices for electricity sold by the Ignalina AES, and the wages of AES personnel will be reviewed.

Anatoliy Piruyev, USSR first deputy minister of atomic power engineering and industry; Saulius Kutas, Lithuanian deputy minister of power engineering; Anatoliy Khromchenko, director of the Ignalina AES; and Yuriy Zhilin, chief of the Western Construction Directorate, took part in the meeting.

The leaders of the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power Engineering and Industry left for a meeting of Ignalina AES personnel at which it was planned to sign a collective contract.

Landsbergis on Soviet Envoy's FRG Speech

PM2703165191 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 16 Mar 91 p 1

[ELTA report: "Vytautas Landsbergis on Soviet Diplomat's Speech"]

[Text] REUTER has reported from Bonn that Vladislav Terekhov, Soviet ambassador to Germany, speaking at the donations fund headed by the opposition Social Democratic Party, said that foreign aid for Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian separatists would pose a threat to security throughout Europe. "The Baltic republics were part of the Russian confederation for 200 years and have been part of the Soviet Union for 50 years, and they will remain such," he stressed.

In this connection Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, has submitted a commentary that was read out at a Supreme Soviet briefing 13 March.

"Soviet diplomacy is shrugging off its sheep's clothing," the commentary said. "Only a defender of imperialism who does not recognize any human rights or peoples' rights can describe as rebel separatists a people more than 70 percent of whose residents [as published] have advocated independence. Mr. Terekhov's historical digressions on Lithuania within the 'confederation' of feudal Russia are beneath criticism; they either constitute grievous incompetence or a lie in search of an incompetent ear. In the legal sense Lithuania was never a republic of the USSR, just as Kuwait was not a province of Iraq. However, it is the blatant blackmail of Europe that presents the greatest threat to international law and peace: If Europe supports the victims of Soviet aggression, it will find itself in danger. All pledges have been violated—not only the pledge not to violate international security but also the pledge not to threaten to do so. Do the Soviets really have information and analysis which shows that Europe is scared again? If not, they are making their biggest political and psychological mistake," Vytautas Landsbergis said.

RSFSR

Further Reportage on Moscow Demonstrations

LD2903141491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Text] First Deputy Chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Khasbulatov reported at the congress today that 150,000-200,000 people took part in yesterday's demonstration in Moscow. As a whole the demonstrators behaved calmly.

It is true that incidents did take place. Some groups of people attempted to smash shop windows and to start a fight. However, the militia intervened and it was possible to normalize the situation.

PRAVDA on Security Situation

PM2903163391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 91 First Edition p 6

[N. Krivomazov report under "From Scene of Events" rubric: "Fire Could Not Be Avoided"]

[Text] I had never noticed before yesterday that the bronze statue of Pushkin in downtown Moscow looks like it is clutching its right hand to its heart. As if it had just caught sight of an unseemly picture. At the spot at the foot of the statue where rendezvous are usually appointed, a first aid van had taken up position. And a red water cannon with the number 18-65 was aimed above the statue's head at the passersby behind its back. Overall, you clutch at your heart involuntarily in order to endure, in order to get through the heartfelt pain brought on by the increasingly abnormal confrontation of today's political forces and impotence, of the passions induced by rallies.

At the same time, not only the laws of physics but also the everyday laws of our society maintain that, normally, the force of an action is equal to the force of the counteraction. In total, according to my estimates, there were literally hundreds of trucks and thousands of soldiers, members of the special purpose militia, and regular militiamen assembled yesterday in Moscow.

I attempted to look at this charming force without politics, so to speak. The result was not very cheerful. In the gateway of the Lenin Library was a fire engine with two "cannon," and about 15 buses with militiamen from the Moscow area.

"Guys, what job have you been given?"

"Not to allow disorder."

"And what do you call disorder?"

"The absence of order..."

THe Hotel Moskva is surrounded by an impassable ring of cars. They were not allowing people into the underground pedestrian crossing into Red Square, nor even to get through to Red Square itself. By the Kremlin's Trinity Gates, at the bus stops of the No. 3 bus and the No. 1 trolleybus, a damp notice hung in the wind, announcing that the stop was temporarily being withdrawn. Our PRAVDA staff driver became fearful: By evening it will be impossible to get around Moscow, all the central streets and side streets will have been "sealed off."

In Manezhnaya Square, newly washed by street-cleaning trucks, a colonel armed with a walkie-talkie figures out that I am a journalist, and catches me by the sleeve:

"Listen, PRAVDA, just write, please, that I have been doing nothing for three years!"

"Meaning?"

"I have been guarding Manezhnaya Square for three years, screw the place! When will we finally realize that potatoes grow in a potato field, not in the asphalt of the capital. That we need to work with our hands and our heads, but for some reason we all work with the tongue, always the tongue..."

On every side gapers assemble, attracted by the unprecedented concentration of security forces. Someone is already talking excitedly into a public telephone: "Listen, old man, get down to the center quick, something is going on here!" But in actual fact precisely nothing is going on. Simply that from 1000 onward more and more idlers and gapers have been gathering in Moscow.

There are even more spectators on Tchaikovsky Street, where, as in 1977, the old building of the U.S. Embassy has caught fire. "The hottest embassy in town," Vladimir Kostryukov, spokesman of the capital's Krasnopresnenskiy State Fire Inspectorate, joked sadly. He prefers handling figures. At 1018 the alarm call was received, and at 1023 the firemen arrived on the scene. And then for a whole 32 minutes they were simply not allowed to get to the fire. The Americans thought they could manage themselves, but were unsuccessful. Evidently, in the course of reconstruction work on the embassy—which, incidentally, the Americans are carrying out themselves—an elevator shaft, whether from a short circuit or from welding, caught fire, and in an instant the flames shot up to the 10th floor and began lapping at the roof. Happily, it seems that there were no injuries.

Well, may God, as they say, grant that this fire is the only one on this day. That political passions do not flare up, and that this fire does not spread to your life and mine. And for this both the organizers of rallies and those who guard them must learn to behave humanely.

People's Deputy on OMON Suppression

LD3103170491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 31 Mar 91

[Text] Now we go over to our correspondent Yelena Kuznetsova. Her report gives details of OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] dispersing participants in a demonstration at Soviet Square in Moscow.

[Kuznetsova] Ilya Vladislavovich Konstantinov, a Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputy, a member of the Democratic Russia bloc, is with me in the Granite Hall. Please could you tell us what took place yesterday in Soviet Square? What have you found out?

[Konstantinov] Good day, dear listeners. Yesterday evening I received a phone call and was informed that around 1600 a group of citizens was forceably detained by a OMON unit—including the use of batons—at the Yuriy Dolgorukiy monument when it tried to set up a picket at the monument and place placards that demanded Gorbachev's resignation, support for the miners on strike, and also a demand to scrap the president's decree on prohibiting demonstrations.

[Kuznetsova] Who were the organizers of this picket?

[Konstantinov] A group of Leningraders, participants in a civil opposition movement, and also, members of the Democratic Union Party, were the organizers of the pickets.

[Kuznetsova] How many people were detained and where are they kept?

[Konstantinov] Eleven people were detained and the detainees are being kept at the 109 branch of the militia. They will, most probably, be put on trial on Monday. They have been accused of organizing an unsanctioned meeting.

[Kuznetsova] Do you have any evidence of people that were not even taking part in the picket and were simply passing by being hurt?

[Konstantinov] As I was told by one of the picket participants, when they were being detained, Muscovites that were passing by tried to intervene and protect the pickets. A clash took place and the passing citizens, Muscovites, were also hurt.

[Kuznetsov] And as we were informed, women were also hurt...

[Konstantinov, interrupting] And women were also hurt.

[Kuznetsova] ... who didn't even try to protect the pickets and who were just passing by on their own business.

Well, we will really have to address the militia's 109 branch for details of this.

[Konstantinov] And the Moscow Frunzenskiy rayon directorate of internal affairs.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you. I would like to remind you that Ilya Vladislavovich Konstantinov, a Russia's people's deputy, was speaking live.

Pro-Yeltsin Rally in Leningrad Reported

LD0104084491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2050 GMT 31 Mar 91

[Text] A meeting in support of Russian leader Boris Yeltsin and the striking miners took place at Leningrad's Dvortsovaya Ploshchad today. The Russian news agency reports that about 5,000 people took part in the demonstration. The meeting was markedly anticommunist and antigovernment in nature.

Silayev Urges Better Conditions for Enterprises

LD3103130791 Moscow TASS in English 1243 GMT 31 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents Boris Zverev and Yuriy Sizov]

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—The Russian Federation, the largest of the Union republics, does not have today either hard currency or strategic reserves. The government actually has at its disposal the only economic resource—people's business activity, Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev believes.

In a TASS interview he commented on some provisions of the economic programme, which was presented by him to the third Russian extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies on Saturday. The congress has been in session in the Kremlin for the fourth day.

As early as in the first six months of this year, the Russian Government hopes to create legal guarantees for the entrepreneurial activity of the republic's citizens. "It is time to give our citizens the right to amass their own capital and to ensure the legal protection of this right," Silayev noted.

To this end, Silayev said, the Russian leadership "plans to reduce taxes on citizens' personal profits," which, it was estimated, would help boost production and, consequently, fill the state treasury.

At point, he said, is the display of citizens' entreprenuerial qualities not only in small business, but also at large enterprises which form the bedrock of the Russian Federation economy. Silayev rejected the possibility of buying plants by shadow economy dealers. "In this case, there is such a long-practised scheme as the joint-stock form of ownership and our programme sets out very clearly the government's actions in this direction."

For each citizen to have a chance to engage in enterprise, Silayev proposes that the principle of the so-called popular actions be used, when all Russian potential, which is

estimated to total 1.5 trillion rubles, is divided, as it were, among people, which gives them the jump-start capital of 7,000 to 8,000 rubles for each.

Silayev pins great hopes on foreign businessmen who "will help saturate the consumer goods market and update the technological potential of industry." He said he did not fear that the Russian economy would be auctioned off.

"It is impermissible to sell whole factoris and plants. But it is very important to give foreign businessmen a chance to have holdings in our enterprises, because together with their capital they bring modern technology," Silayev noted.

He said foreign investments should be channelled into the modernisation of the heavy and extractive industries.

Miners' Representatives Not Invited to Talks

LD2903235391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2050 GMT 29 mar 91

[Text] In many mining collectives of the country, the elections of representatives for the talks with the Union government on the package of economic and social demands of the miners have started. The talks are scheduled for 2 April. The representatives of the mining enterprises or strike are not invited to the talks.

TASS Updates Situation in Coalfields

LD2903213791 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS—The election of delegates from the Pechora coal field (the north of the European part of the USSR) to a meeting with Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, scheduled for April 2, was held in Vorkuta and Inta today.

The joint plenary meeting of the Komi republican committee and the control commission of the republican branch of the Russian Communist Party recognised today that the economic demands of the miners were justified, in general, but opposed the use of strikes in the struggle for the meeting of those demands. Party committees and all Communists were assigned to explain to labour collectives that it was necessary to press for the solution of their problems without inflicting damage on the national economy.

Miners from the Kuznetsk coal field are continuing the strike and insisting on the fulfilment of their political demands. Rallies were held in several cities of the region in support for the Russian parliament and government. Workers' committees of the Prokopievskgidrougol amalgamation said that they refuse to take part in the April 2 meeting at the Cabinet of Ministers, because it will discuss only economic demands.

Part of the Donbass coal field is continuing the strike. Twenty one out of 122 mines of the Donetsk region stopped producing coal and delivering it to consumers. According to the republican mineworkers' union, six mines are on strike in the Lugansk region and five in the Dnepropetrovsk region.

Seventeen enterprises of the Ukrzapadugol amalgamation did not resume work either. According to IZVESTIYA, especially alarming information came from the town of Pervomaisk, Lugansk region: As a result of a long stoppage, a long-wall face collapsed at the Zolotoe mine. At least a month and tens of thousands of roubles will be needed to restore it. On the whole, millions of roubles will be needed to restore the mining industry, affected by the strike.

Official Alleges Plan To Shoot Down Satellite

LD2903175791 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 29 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Quite a lot of different things were said at yesterday's rallies in Moscow, including on the subject of radio and television. In particular, as the POSTFAKTUM agency reports, Mikhail Poltoranian, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] minister for the press and mass media, declared that there was a secret decree of the USSR president providing for the possibility of shooting down a Russian satellite which could be used for transmitting Radio Rossii programs on the First Program of All-Union Radio. He also did not rule out the possibility of a water and electricity blockade of the Ostankino TV Center.

It's all very curious—just like a thriller or some fantastic tale. Only we are talking of serious things here, and there is no room for flights of fancy. Mind you, the esteemed RSFSR minister for the press and mass media has already been discovered putting out information that, to put it mildly, did not correspond to the facts, and this has even been the subject of discussion in the USSR Supreme Soviet's Ethics commission. Now the same thing has happened again. One can only regret that this sort of information should be put out at a moment when calm, restraint, and clarity are needed to tackle our difficult problems.

PRAVDA on 28 Mar RSFSR Congress Session

PM2903144191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1, 3

[O. Kuzmina, G. Ovcharenko, and A. Chereshnev report on opening of Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies: "Field of Tension"]

[Text] Probably no other Congress of People's Deputies has ever opened in such a fraught situation. In our opinion, it is not so much a question of the grim

economic situation—people have by now gotten used to periodically tightening their belts—as of the political situation.

Lest we get accused of prejudice, let us recall the development of events. First came the statement of the six leading deputies of the Russian legislature, in which they essentially expressed no confidence in the chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. It became obvious that a crisis had broken out in the federal republic's supreme organ of state power. On the initiative of a large group of deputies the decision was adopted to convene an extraordinary congress.

An emergency situation? What is there to be said about this?

In civilized countries—as it is fashionable to refer to them now—with rich legislative traditions, such collisions arise fairly frequently. And they are settled by constitutional means relatively peacefully, without stirring up passions in the media, and without appealing to the mob.

What we are witnessing is essentially the first crisis in the history of the Russian legislature, in which there are three points—the political and socioeconomic situation in the RSFSR and measures to overcome the crisis; the national-state system of the RSFSR (Federative Treaty); and the Union Treaty. You will agree that not just the future of Russia and its inhabitants but that of the whole country depends largely on the solution of each one of these issues. However, the deputies never got as far as discussing them. As you already know, the congress broke off its work. But let us start at the beginning...

Barely had the Russian anthem finished and, after the deputies' registration, B. Yeltsin declared the congress open, when Deputy P. Filippov from Leningrad went up to the microphone and asked that the floor be given to Deputy L. Volkov to make a statement on behalf of 220 of his colleagues.

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers, the statement ran, has adopted the unprecedented decision banning working people's demonstrations, rallies, and marches in Moscow for the duration of the proceedings of the extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. This decree is tantamount to a declaration of a state of emergency in the city through 15 April. The pretext for this decree was provided by a letter, signed by 29 deputies and addressed to the country's president, in which isolated instances of unethical behavior on the part of voters toward deputies are presented as the rule, and this is used to draw the incorrect conclusion that voters are exerting pressure on the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. We, the statement-letter says, regard this step of the USSR president and Government as a means of applying pressure on the congress which may lead to the disruption of its work.

Volkov also read out a proposed draft congress resolution. It says: "The congress notes that the decision of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers of 25 March 1991 banning working people's demonstrations, pickets, and marches in Moscow from 26 March through 15 April, and the USSR president's decree of 26 March of this year, which removes Moscow's internal affairs organs from the jurisdiction of the Russian Ministry of Internal Affairs, are a violation of Article 50 of the USSR Constitution, of Articles 48 and 76 of the RSFSR Constitution, and of the Declaration on Russia's State Sovereignty. The Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies resolves that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution of 25 March of the current year on the temporary ban in Moscow of rallies, street marches, and demonstrations be declared invalid; that the USSR president's decree of 26 March of the current year be declared invalid, and that the RSFSR Council of Ministers be instructed to ensure public order in the city and oblast."

After this, stormy debates broke out, as was to be expected. It must also be mentioned that while the "letter of the 220" was being read out, the speaker was interrupted by shouts and banging. It was difficult to restore calm in the hall. Apart from highly emotional statements, some deputies nonetheless tried to call for order. So, for example, one of the speakers stated that the congress was not in a position to adopt any decision whatsoever, since the group to supervise the electronic voting system, about which deputies have some complaints, had not been elected yet. A vote on the draft resolution would be possible only after the working organs and the said group were elected.

The congress accepted this point. After the composition of the group had been approved and S. Kyshtymov made a statement on its work—during which time the congress participants had an opportunity to recover their composure—a question was put to the vote stipulating that all the main issues should be subjected to a roll-call vote, and that the results of the voting be printed out and distributed among deputies. This proposal was accepted.

The chairman declared that it was necessary to elect a secretariat. Again he ran into objections—what question can there be of electing working organs when the congress is being "blockaded"? Another outburst of emotions put off the election of the secretariat. There was talk about an "honorary captivity" in which deputies have allegedly been placed by the Cabinet of Ministers, about "soldiers' bayonets under which it is impossible to work freely," and even about the necessity to move the congress from the capital to another venue—Leningrad, for example.

But there were also other, more well-weighed statements. One of the deputies stated that the congress, instead of looking for compromise solutions, has chosen open opposition to the center, confrontation with it. Deputy S. Sheboldayev called on those present to stop arguing and finally get down to business. Expressing the opinion of the "Sotrudnichestvo" [Cooperation] group, he added

that it is inexpedient at this congress to examine political and "personality" issues. Given the current situation in the RSFSR and the country as a whole, it is necessary to concentrate attention solely on the range of economic problems.

But no end was in sight to the verbal battles. After a debate which lasted for about an hour, a solution was finally found. The proposed resolution was adopted by a majority of votes. R. Khasbulatov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, was instructed to bring it to the notice of the country's president or vice president. Khasbulatov set off to carry out his mission straight from the presidium, especially as the deputies gave him a deadline—he had to report back on the results of the talks by 1400 hours. After that the congress was to decide whether it would continue its proceedings or not.

Having dealt with the first stumbling block, the congress moved on to the next questions. But even the discussion of the candidacies for the secretariat was anything but calm. Ultimately order was restored and the secretariat was elected.

Finally the congress arrived at the discussion of the agenda. Various proposals were submitted. For example, the acute question of the introduction of a Russian presidency was posed. Deputy O. Rumyantsev declared that it is necessary at this congress to take the second step to restore Russia's statehood. If the question of the presidency is posed, the question of the introduction of amendments to the RSFSR Constitution will automatically have to be included on the agenda.

Deputy V. Kiselev proposed that the issue of the miners' strikes be included. Miners are putting forward political demands, so this problem cannot be brushed aside, the speaker said. Other things aside, it was also proposed that the law on the recall of people's deputies be adopted, and it was pointed out that dealing only with economic issues, as had been proposed in the morning, was impossible. They are most closely interconnected with a political situation which is far from normal, and furthermore it would be difficult to discuss the Union treaty itself without prior assessment of the Federative treaty.

Without reaching any specific decisions aside from the aforementioned resolution, the deputies dispersed for a short recess.

Afterward the floor was immediately given to Khasbulatov, who had just returned from the USSR president. A long conversation had taken place, Khasbulatov reported. The USSR president emphasized his respect for the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, but he remained adamant: The troops would not be withdrawn from the capital's streets throughout 28 March. This will be possible only as of 29 March. A considerable section of the deputies welcomed the president's decision.

In the subsequent debate two viewpoints were ultimately expressed. According to one it was proposed to break off the congress proceedings until the demands contained in the resolution adopted by the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies that morning were met, and meanwhile continue the session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. This proposal failed to gain the required number of votes.

The second proposal—to suspend the congress proceedings until 1000 hours 29 March and to devote the remaining time to consultations on items of the agenda between various deputy groups—was then put to the vote. This proposal suited the majority—615 people voted in favor; 354 deputies voted against. One of them was R. Mukhamadiyev, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet Commission for questions of the development of culture, language, and national traditions and the protection of the historical heritage.

"I voted against," he said. "At such a difficult time for the country we are again engaging in political blather instead of attending to issues which brook no delay. I see nothing good in this. We would do better to continue our work."

And so, the Third Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies has suspended its work. In our opinion this is not the most constructive of solutions. Especially since it is not known what tonight's reaction to this will be in the capital's streets...

"Confrontation has never led to anything good, it is impermissible to create another field of tension," Deputy V. Lisin said as we were leaving the Great Kremlin Palace. "We should be thinking about Russia's fate and not about ambitions."

It is difficult to disagree with him...

RSFSR Congress 29 Mar

Session Resumes After Break To Decide Agenda

LD2903122191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network Russian 1000 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Excerpts] The Extraordinary Third Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies is continuing today in the Grand Kremlin Palace. Our correspondent, Olga Vasilenko, will report on today's work there:

[Vasilenko] Just five days have been allotted for the congress. At least that is what is written in the rules for the congress' work. But the agenda has, unfortunately, not been approved; rather, it has been voted on. An hour and a half ago they voted on all the points as a package, as defined by Khasbulatov, who is in the chair today. The ratio of votes was like this: 537 for, 423 against. But immediately there were protests. Again and again there were new proposals.

I will report on everything in the order in which it happened. [passage omitted]

Deputies insisted again and again on reports by Isakov or maybe somebody else from the Group of Six. There

were also demands to adopt an appeal to the miners. [passage omitted on generalities on other points raised by deputies] As I said, a package of points on the agenda has been adopted. It contains three points: on the political and social and economic situation in the RSFSR and measures to get out of the crisis (Khasbulatov proposed that deputies think about the appeal to the miners within the framework of this point); secondly, the national-state structure of the RSFSR, the federation treaty, the referendum, and the implementation of its decision; and third, the Union treaty.

Doubt is being cast on the work of the conciliation commission and that of some of the members of the conciliation commission themselves. The implementation of the decisions of the referendum means the issue of the presidency, and a considerable proportion of the congress believes that this issue is not ready for discussion and that it needs to be postponed to another congress. The result of such fruitless vigils at the microphones—and there is still a long line for the microphones—was an hour-long interval for another round of work by the conciliation commission. The commission passed by our correspondents' stand into the hall, together with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, who participated in its work. [passage omitted]

The presidium is in place. Deputy (Novikov) from Moscow has spoken on behalf of the conciliation commission and proposed the results of the conciliation commission's work. I will report about this in our subsequent news bulletins. In general, there are few deviations, but a lot of new nuances that will probably be put to a vote by the deputies. I will close here.

TASS Sums Up Debate Over Agenda

LD2903161291 Moscow TASS in English 1456 GMT 29 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS—The extraordinary congress of Russian people's deputies, which opened in the Kremlin on Thursday, adopted its agenda only by noon. Agreement on all items of the agenda was reached only after stormy debates at the congress's sessions and at two meetings of conference commissions with the participation of representatives from all groups of deputies.

President of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin's report "On Political and Socio-Economic Situation in the Russian Federation and Measures To Pull the Country Out of the Crisis" was endorsed as the first item on the agenda.

True, many deputies demanded that Yeltsin should report on the work accomplished by him rather than just describe the dramatic socio-economic situation that has formed in the USSR's largest republic and the tasks faced by the republican leadership. But they appeared to be in the minority. The first item was passed by 612-to-341 votes with 27 abstentions.

The reports by Vladimir Isakov and Mikhail Zakharov were also included in the first item on the agenda after heated debates. The first will reflect the position of those who evaluate critically Yeltsin's policy and the second is expected to come out in support of the Russian leadership.

Deputies indulged in lengthy debates on the form in which the congress should discuss the dramatic situation that has arisen in Russia in conjunction with pit workers' strike. It was decided not to single out this issue into a separate item but to examine it during the discussion of the first item on the agenda.

The most steamy debates erupted over whether to discuss the question of introducing the post of president of the Russian federation at the present congress. Fifty two per cent of all Russian electors voted in its favour during the republican referendum held in March 17. However, the result of the referendum should be legalised.

The most radical participants in the congress insisted that this issue be included as a separate item, but their proposal was voted down. Deputies decided to discuss the results of the Russian referendum during a debate on the second item—"On the National- State Set-Up of the Russian Federation (a Federation treaty)".

The study of amendments to the Constitution on introducing executive presidency in the republic is likely to be entrusted to the Russian legislature and put to debate only at the next congress.

The third item on the agenda—on the Union treaty—did not spark disputes.

Yeltsin is expected to deliver his report at the evening session.

Vote on Agenda Reported

LD2903145491 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1130 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Summary] Legislative correspondent Olga Vasilenko reports from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] congress on the first four hours' work, or rather three hours, as one hour was given over to the work of the Conciliation Commission on the agenda. During voting on the question of the results of the RSFSR referendum and the implementation of its results, the question did not get a majority, only 508 votes. Deputy Varov proposed that the question of the RSFSR presidency be included in the agenda, but it did not get a majority. The vote was 465 for, 447 against. The draft decree on power was also voted on, with only 373 for and 515 against.

Deputies then discussed whether to include an item about the miner's strike or to examine it separately. It will be examined within the context of Yeltsin's report.

The third item on the agenda on the Union treaty received an absolute majority. Among other topics is an item about recognizing the authority of RSFSR people's deputies elected between the congresses and on endorsing the RSFSR procurator general.

The deputies also have two very important documents to discuss—a draft law on the recall of a RSFSR people's deputy and a draft law on local self-government of local soviets. There were all sorts of other items raised, including attitudes to rallies, but Ruslan Khasbulatov said this does not relate to the agenda. There was also a question about the work of the electronic voting system, and about other issues.

Yeltsin Requests More Than Hour To Speak

LD2903142891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1335 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Report by Igor Zorin]

[Text] So far the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic congress has voted that the rapporteur has requested an hour and a half. I am referring to Comrade Yeltsin. There will also be two other reports by deputies Isakov and Zakharov at 20 minutes each.

One of the deputies has come to the microphone and asked for these reports to be postponed until a later day. I think that they will nevertheless be delivered.

Comrade Zakharov, one of the co-rapporteurs, is stating his point of view as to what is the point of order for discussion and how matters should proceed. Now listen to music. If Comrade Yeltsin's report is announced we will start its live relay.

Yeltsin Address on Conditions in Republic

LD2903154891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1341 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Speech by Boris Yeltsin, president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, at the Third Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—live]

[Text] Esteemed people's deputies, the third extraordinary congress has begun its work in a critical period. The Russian Federation is experiencing one of the most complex and dramatic moments in its history. We will still have the opportunity to work out why a country that is so rich in natural resources, that was developing dynamically at the start of the century, has reached the edge of an abyss in the end; why a people numbering many millions, with a great culture and the richest traditions, today feels a spiritual crisis and a shortage of belief. And yet, Russia's potential for renewal is far from exhausted. The crash will occur only when general apathy, indifference, or blind aggression become the dominant sentiment in society, and we are obliged not to allow that. I hope that all of us who have assembled in this hall are united by the sincere desire to do everything to ensure that the period of shocks being experienced by the republic ends as soon as possible. I believe that the difference existing between us will, in the final analysis, not prevent fruitful work. We all have one land, one life, and one ultimate goal. Speaking about the Russian Federation's current position, there is need to make an analysis, albeit a brief one, of the sources and foundations of the system that has led to a situation where, in terms of man's quality of life, we have ended up far behind many countries, bringing up the rear of world civilization. It has been said several times already that the economic system in our country is fundamentally linked to the political and has existed ineffectively here for over seven decades. We are living badly, not because we do little work or are bad at it. The main cause of the people's chronic poverty is the fact that our economic system ignores the individual as a matter of principle. He is still unable to guarantee elementary living conditions for himself and his family. Housing, food, and clothing are all a chronically unresolved problem.

Everything in our economy is upside down. Raw materials are exceptionally cheap, yet consumer goods and services are very expensive. Every year hundreds of thousands of hectares of arable land are taken out of agricultural use but it is very difficult for those who can and want to work the land, even though we have the Russian laws, to obtain land. The state does not have the resources for the most essential things for children and old men, but at the same time tens of billions are buried in the land in the form of absurdly gigantic canals. The mountains of valuable waste materials are growing. Enormous lifeless boxes of new workshops stand idle, where work is not started for years—and all of this is according to the plan. For decades all gigantic projects and all state expenditures were paid for at the expense of the people and at the expense of planned limitations on consumption. A person receives a fifth of what he creates. So is it worth being surprised today that so little has been done for normal human life? And a powerful political system ensured the existence of this misshapened economy and preserved and ensured stability for it. For many years it fulfilled the most important functions of total control over all and any significant processes in the country, including the work of defense enterprises, and meddled in personal lives. It took on itself the role of guarantor of established order. The administrative and bureaucratic system carried out a command function. Having destroyed powerful natural stimuli that roused a person into active work, it also created refined mechanisms that took their place. Personal interest was replaced by orders and directive and fear in the face of repression. All of them, however, turned out to be extremely inefficient; in the end they could not but lead the country to stagnation and, in the long term, to collapse.

The function of redistribution was the most important function of the system that came about in the country.

All the sum total of resources and wealth was concentrated in its hands, and that means that both the principle of redistribution and the volumes of it were defined here. The right to redistribute that which had been created gave the system the possibility of determining how a people of many millions would live in the future. Gigantic resources that were at the disposal of an unlimited power in an enormous country created the illusion of the feasibility of implementing the most unthinkable dream.

The monopoly of the dogmas of Marxist-Leninist doctrine has moved us away from the latest scientific concepts, the present-day theories of the market economy and of the law-governed state, and the humanistic theories of culture. These theories have given a colossal impulse to the flourishing of tens of countries of the world, opened the path to progress for many peoples, and ensured profound changes throughout the world.

In our country the greatest achievements of human intellect were in fact banned. During the greater part of the 20th century the intellectual life of Soviet society was under the brutal diktat of 100-year-old theoretical tenets that had been declared sacred. All this led to immense losses, to debts to the people, and we must today speak about what needs to be returned to our people:

1. People must have their economic and political rights and freedoms returned to them in full.

2. The national cultures of Russia's peoples, which have been lost in many respects, are to be revived and the restoration of multilevel ties with Russian emigres is to be ensured.

3. We must create the conditions for the return to Russia of a world market and world culture system.

4. We should eliminate the ugly system of a domination of numerous ministerial monopolies and bureaucratic economic structures, and ensure the decisive priority for the industries that work for consumption and raise the living standard.

5. The consequences of very grave ecological catastrophes are to be overcome, and new ecological damage that continues to threaten many on Russia's territory is to be prevented.

This entire colossal debt to the people has arisen as a result of the domination of the system of totalitarian ideology and power that engendered a most brutal exploitation of the working people and the rechanneling of the country's gigantic resources for the sake of maintaining excessive military expenditures and huge unreturnable financial injections into the economies of other countries.

Today we are fully justified in drawing the conclusion that in the conditions of our country, ideological dogmas and postulates continue to take priority over economic ones. That is why we have once again totally come up against the threat of famine, a shortage everywhere, hyperinflation, dictatorship, and intellectual poverty, having never come a step nearer to the models of flourishing states.

And there will clearly be discussion about this at the congress, too. All this is happening against the background of crisis phenomena, when a grave illness has struck all fields and all spheres of life. We are seeing a catastrophic slump in production, although rates of production in Russia are twice...[changes thought] the reduction in rate is below the all-Union level, nevertheless there is a slump. The standard of living of the population in the social spheres is being reduced. And with a price increase the situation will get even worse.

The crisis in culture is proving to be ever more painful. Social tension in society is on the increase. Such is the result of the seventy years of totalitarianism in our country. Against this background the political activity of the population is intensifying. People are being drawn into politics not because they are being manipulated. The understanding is growing more and more that without the participation of the people itself, the situation will not be able to change for the better. Two opposing political courses have now been clearly defined in the country. The first is the course toward implementing the strategy of profound changes in all spheres of life. It proposes the carrying out of radical economic reforms; the regeneration of the actual market essence of the economy and the solving of human problems; the radical renewal of the USSR and its transformation into a union of sovereign states, with considerably reduced functions of the center, functions consisting of only those transferred to it by the republics; and a policy of legal reform consolidating the priority of the individual and his rights and freedoms. It proposes to dismantle the political and ideological monopoly of one party and to develop democratic institutions, to create and strengthen effective mechanisms for the social protection of the individual, and to carry out a social policy aimed at liberating the activeness of the individual and his initiative and creativity. And, finally, this is a course toward conducting an open foreign policy.

Today something else is becoming clearly evident—a political course that is quite opposite in its nature. Its main characteristics can be seen fairly clearly. These are to further preserve and even strengthen the economic monopoly of the center, despite the fact that under the current conditions this monopoly leads to economic disaster and to a further decline in the standard of life. This is a course toward the modernization of a unitary state under the camouflage of the mask of a renewed union.

It is a declaration of a tough political struggle against the democratic forces of the country, including attempts at a direct overthrow of the legally elected bodies of power by the so- called committees for national salvation. This is the course for the strangulation of glasnost—the only achievement of perestroyka. Lies, blatant slander, and illegal bans are typical manifestations of it. This is the

course for curbing the people's activity and initiative in all spheres, including the economy. This is nothing more than a return to the policy that was conducted before April 1985 and that caused great damage to Russia and the country. This course is only capable of delivering an unhappy pesent existence or even its deterioration.

The presence of two policies and two political courses is a fundamental pecularity of today. The future of Russia, of the country, and to a significant extent of the whole world depends on which of the two will be adopted by the people and which will take the upper hand.

Such a situation has come about not through the will of individual people and was not created artificially by some forces. It is the result of the political development and an objective result of perestroyka. Alienation of many millions of people from power has been increasing for a long time, and by the mid-1980's it had reached threatening proportions. It was more and more difficult to keep them under control. Neither the information isolation of the country nor the information self-isolation from the outside world, vodka, or the giant industry of the party propaganda could help. Under these conditions an attempt was made to restore the people's trust at least partially.

Such ideas as the priority of values common to all mankind, glasnost, and democratization were put to use. They immediately found numerous advocates among various strata of the population. People believed in the seriousness of intentions to reorganize life and sincerely adopted these values. A wave of people's activity and initiative rose, but soon it turned out that their services were not much needed. It became obvious that it was not more than a tactical device, the purpose of which is to form an obedient puppet democracy. It was meant to give a civilized look to the preserved diktat of the partocracy [party bureaucracy]. Noble goals were proclaimed, but in reality main efforts were directed at preserving the centralized, distributive economy, the monopoly of the supreme bureaucracy, and the lack of rights on the part of the peoples.

The conservative, anti-perestroyka forces were provided with most-favored status, while the proponents of perestroyka were subjected to constant pressure and could count only on themselves. The objective outcome of the past six years has shown that we were dealing not with perestroyka, but rather with the last phase of stagnation. Disintegration and breakdown have accelerated and acquired a general nature. Reforms were not embarked upon. Internal policy, to judge not by words but by the totality of what has been done, in its basic manifestations has remained the same, and even more inconsistent and even less effective.

However, there are also positive results. The country is no longer where it was. The main thing that has been changed is people; they have recognized the truth about the society in which they live, about its history, about life in other countries. Millions have awakened. The rotten totalitarian system has definitively lost social support. Democratic forces have grown up and are becoming strong. A major result of the past few years has been the weakening of the unitarian foundations of the state and the acquisition by the republics of their sovereignty. This is a most important factor in the formation of the new union of sovereign states. What role has been played by the Supreme Soviets, by the governments of the republics for 20 or 30 years or even two or three years ago? Both politically and practically they fulfilled a purely decorative role. Their functions in the system of state government amounted to passing on commands and directives from the center to lower levels and monitoring the fulfillment of decisions made at the top. Now the situation has been radically changed but not by the radicalism of republican leaders, not by their aspiration for confrontation. The situation was radically changed in the past, in 1990, when, as a result of the freely expressed will of the people, new organs of power were formed in the republics. They could no longer play the role of passive conductors of the policy of Union organs; they could not because there were millions of other voters behind them; they could not because the policy of the center differs from people's basic interests. The example of yesterday shows that this gulf is growing. The republican organs of power have refused to work blindly and unquestioningly. But the central leadership does not understand this and continues the policy of diktat through inertia; it has striven and is striving with all its might to preserve the old, customary methods of work.

The totalitarian system came to find itself increasingly isolated. A polarization of political forces began in the country. The conservative forces gradually let the perestroykan mask slip. Shyly at first, but then bolder, they began speaking about the need for revenge, and finally they went on the offensive. This offensive was mounted on several fronts at the same time, but the main blows were aimed at the economy. Of late the absurd accusation has been made that it was the democrats who destroyed the economy. I believe the time has come to identify the true roots of this most profound economic crisis to which each of us is witness.

First and foremost we must define what Russia is and what the Russian economy is. Though it has 149 million people, there is precious little that belongs to our republic on its own territory. That is particularly true of the production sphere. In RSFSR industry, the share of fixed assets under Russian jurisdiction amounts to less than 15 percent. Just imagine: just 15 percent! The basic industries of fuel and power generation, iron and steel, and machine-building belong entirely to the Union. The republic owns essentially no industries such as chemical, power engineering, instrument manufacturing, and radio. Thus, the Russian economy is profoundly dependent on the Union departments. The jurisdiction of the republic and the local authorities extends only to light industry, the agro-industrial complex, around half of the fixed assets of the construction industry, and around a third of the transport industry, plus one-fifth of the

timber industry complex. The declaration of economic sovereignty at the end of last year so far has not changed the situation substantially, but it has served as a good cover for the center's own failures. They are now only too willing to dump everything onto the republic, even though the truth of the matter is that it is all quite the reverse. Such accusations are quite groundless and are a smoke screen. Even if the government and the legislature of the republic had set themselves this goal, it would have been impossible because it is impossible to destroy something that does not lie under our jurisdiction. Quite the opposite: The chaos in the Union sector of the economy creates intolerable conditions for the functioning of republican enterprises.

I will cite just one example that is especially topical today: the critical situation regarding agricultural equipment, which everyone knows about. But Russia produces neither the equipment itself nor the spare parts for it. Almost all tractors used in the Russian countryside are produced at Union works. It is the same picture with the production of motor vehicles, tires, and so on. Surely the Russian bodies of power are not responsible for the decline in the output of tractors by 18 percent last year, and that the decline is continuing? It is not the Russian Government that is to blame for tens of thousands of pieces of equipment standing idle for want of spare parts, which are also produced at Union enterprises. But as a result, many Russian fields will not be sown this spring, and Russians will feel the effect of a possible decline in food production. And they will again ask questions of us. That is why we talk about this and intend firmly to strengthen our republic's economic sovereignty. The Russian economy remains to this day, in essence, colonial and dependent. But, of course, we will not evade the questions. We are prepared to take Union enterprises under Russia's jurisdiction.

It is not Russia that has caused the deterioration of supplies, the fall of production in basic industries, and the massive violation of discipline in deliveries, for most if it is down to relations between Union enterprises. We have not adopted one single confiscation law in respect of the center restricting the movement of goods. The war of laws has nothing to do with it. It is simply that the Union government has long since lost effective control over production. It is not Russia's fault that an acute financial crisis is raging in the country. As you know, the republic does not print money. We control just 12 percent of prices. All this is happening because the Union leadership has simply not been able to take the decison to make the radical economic reforms with which we are already hopelessly late and is continuing to back the old system of economic management, which has, so to speak, been devalued by history itself. There simply is no Union program for the economy. The Union leadership still adheres to the dream of a strong and wise central authority and continues to be reluctant to allow republics to run their own economy. While the USSR Cabinet of Ministers appears outwardly to be resolute, the effectiveness of its actions is extremely low. The country has gone right into a grandiose and, in many respects, ill-considered reform of retail prices. We must have a clear idea of what such a reform will lead to.

First, price reform will become another cruel blow to the people's standard of living. Second, the situation with an increasing imbalance between trade and currency is giving rise to a new wave of inflation within literally a few months of its being introduced. Free prices will simply increase, whereas state prices will again have to be reviewed. We are already being dragged into hyper-inflation. Third, price reform may give rise to a further exacerbation of economic and political contradictions with regard to the republics and the center. The main thing, however, is that it will not bring the desired stabilization of the market, and therefore it will be extremely painful and, at the end of the day, a measure of little effect.

Many new taxes are being introduced to ensure financial stabilization. At the same time, the ineffective state expenditure is not being reduced, and the financial burden is being passed on to the manufacturers; they are forced to increase prices, which leads to a sharp outbreak of inflation.

The Cabinet of Ministers has done nothing substantial to harmonize the coordinated work of all the republics in order to get out of the economic crisis. Finally, it has entered into a sharp political confrontation with the workers movements, especially the miners. To one's great regret one has to say that if the movement toward the market is going ahead, then it is in spite of, and not thanks to, the actions of the Union republic.

Speaking about the present economic position and the causes of the crisis, we are not striving to square any accounts or to bring about any artificial confrontation, especially as the roots of it lie much deeper. I will merely dwell on one thing which is becoming extremely dangerous today. The fuse of the time bomb, which in their time the predecessors of the present generation of the country's leaders took under their control, has been lit. In the name of the illusion of prosperity, the country and Russia in particular have been solidly bound by imports. The Russian economy has long since been virtually totally dependent on supplies from abroad. This is at a time when the republic has no currency at its disposal. We obtain a considerable amount of the means of production, vital raw materials, dyes, and so on, from imports alone. But the greatest tragedy of our republic is the fact that it has been turned into the biggest importer of grain, when Russia has the richest tradition of grain production.

Grain imports, like a drug, have regenerated the entire structure of Russian agriculture, from sowing to the bakery industry. Almost the whole of poultry farming and egg production are dependent on imports, as are the major part of pork production and a considerable part of milk and beef production. Over the past 20 years Russian grain has considerably degenerated as a foodstuff.

Wheat and rye have started to be transformed into fodder crops. This has entered technology [as heard]. Only one-tenth of Russia's grain harvest goes to the requirements of food, bakery, groats, starch, beer, and so forth. The volume of grain imports is steadily increasing. Whereas in the eighth Five-Year Plan less than 1.5 million tonnes were brought in on average per annum, in the agricultural year 1989- 1990 the figure was 20 million tonnes of grain. In Russia, indeed in the whole country, the amount of our own harvest has almost ceased to influence the food balance. The Russian leadership started work against the background of such a state of affairs and almost immediately there were difficulties with the imports. In January and February the Union government purchased only 600,000 tonnes of imported grain for Russia. This is 70 percent of the agreed level [corrects himself] 17 percent of the agreed level. In the agricultural year 1990-1991 about 5 million tonnes of grain will be brought in. This amounts to less than a quarter of last year's imports and of the agreed figure of 15 million tonnes [figures as heard]. The results of such activity for the republic are extremely grave. On 1 April this year total grain resources are one quarter less than last year. One would not like to see malice in this, but facts are facts. We are at crisis point. The crisis situation is coming about in relations to not only food grain, but also the situation of all food and non-food commodities. The leadership of the republic is doing a great deal to ease the acuteness of the situation, but the policy of effective reaction to problems arising is exhausting itself. Difficulties are also arising in the implementation of the agrarian program adopted by the second Congress of People's Deputies. The additional investments in agriculture determined by the republican budget for this year are already covered by the rise in wholesale prices and tariffs for industrial goods, fuel, building materials, fertilizers, and all types of services being supplied to the countryside.

Along with a reduction in our own finance...[Yeltsin changes thought] Alongside the reduction in financial resources an acute shortage of budget allocations for the social rebirth of the countryside is being experienced.

From all that has been said there is one conclusion: the economic reform program must be decisiviely implemented on a fundamentally new basis.

Esteemed people's deputies: Today it is important to reply to the main question. What needs to be done, what joint action program needs to be implemented? What is needed most of all now is clarity. Several months of searches and attempts to get the situation under control have led us to the unequivocal conclusion that what was drawn up in August and September and proposed as a real way out of the crisis and a transition to a normal economy remains in its principles the only correct, honest, and consistent course toward transforming society's economic base.

From the moment when the center turned down the proposed program, dozens of approaches, concepts, and ideas were tested. Many of them appeared both convincing and effective, but life and economic logic has proved that this was only a waste of time. The economy is steadily collapsing and the people's lives are continuing to deteriorate.

Today the positions have been determined absolutely precisely: Either a return to a repression, commands, ephemeral hopes for an economic miracle; or hard, exhausting, sometimes thankless but concerted work on radically changing the ruinous economic system. This path was contained in the 500 Days program. Taking into account everything that has taken place in the past few months, it is necessary briefly to formulate at the congress the following main program principles and directions. The program for stabilizing the economy and getting the republic out of the crisis on the basis of the government's program is in the deputies' possession.

First and foremost, the viability of the ruble is to be ensured. The purchasing power of money is to be stabilized by sharply tightening up financial policy, reducing the deficit as much as possible, and consolidating the budget at various levels. The real state of affairs as regards the budget is to be revealed at last to the public.

Second: Immediately set up a new market structure ensuring the provision of material resources both to the free sector of the economy and to those who are in particular needs of support as a result of the rapid collapse of economic links, the military- industrial complex, and the complicated, high-technology sectors of industry.

Third: Carry out the declarations that have been made for many years now; grant real economic autonomy to enterprises; move forward actively, on a legislative basis; remove state controls and bring about privatization; give real support to the private sector; and defend it in the system of other forms of property.

Fourth: Finally it is of fundamental importance this very April to have the concept of a coordinated flexible policy for the liberalization of prices. The changeover to free prices should be carried out in stages, taking account of the situation in the market, but in quite a short period.

It remains no less important to have an effective state structural policy; to support basic industries and the export potential; to create a really independent, two-level banking system in the country; and to create a reserve system, broadly to implement land reform and consistently to reorganize agricultural production; to create all necessary conditions for foreign investment in various forms; and to implement a social policy taking account of the actual situation.

In the existing situation it is important to stress the following: Previously, last fall, we proceeded from the assumption that such a program could be implemented by the existing political structures. Today, its distinctive feature is that it organically includes the making of decisive changes in the organization of central and

republican system of political power and administration. This is an essential condition for carrying out the reform.

Every day and every hour shows that the current political structure in the country and in the republic is incapable of ensuring the fulfilment of a real anticrisis program. The need for a number of political conditions without the fulfilment of which effective economic transformations are practically impossible is a qualitatively new aspect in the situation that has taken shape. At the Union and republican levels it is essential to fulfill the following political conditions: to commence without delay a dialogue among all the political forces and professional associations, of all republics, on roundtable principles.

This should be done by the Congress of People's Deputies. The congress, in my view, ought to initiate this. During the work of the congress it ought to commence the forming of this roundtable. Second, there should be formation of a broad democratic coalition of parties, workers' movements, and various associations, including progressive-minded CPSU members. Third, there should be an official renunciation of the use of force [applause], including military force as a means of political struggle. [applause]

Fourth, there should be development of a system of direct people's power and the implementation of the decisions of the Union and republic referendums. [applause]

Fifth, real removal of the party is needed from bodies of the procuracy, judiciary, the KGB, the Army, and the state apparatus. There should be a ban on combining party posts with leading posts in bodies of power and government, including the country's president. [applause]

Sixth, there should be introduction of a system of a division of powers, as the beginning of the construction of a law-governed state, by various levels of legislative power. [applause]

Seventh, there should be annulment of all unconstitutional decisions by Union and republic bodies that limit the political, economic, social, and personal rights and freedoms of citizens and the establishment of an effective system to ensure that they are guaranteed. [applause]

Eighth, there should be real guarantees of political pluralism and of a multiparty system.

Ninth, there should be creation of conditions for the realization of the constitutional right of citizens to reliable information and a guarantee of the independence of the mass media. [applause]

In addition, at the Union level we need:

First, the immediate establishment of a coalition government of popular trust and national accord. [applause] Second, the earliest possible signing of a treaty, which is open for accession, on a union of sovereignstates as a federal, voluntary, and equal association, and the immediate formation of new union bodies. [applause]

At the Russian level:

First, the introduction of the institution of the presidency and the reorganization of the system of executive power; second, the enshrinement of the basic foundations of the national-state structure of the Russian Federation; and third, the immediate lifting of the political, legal, and information blockade with relation to the Russian legislature and Government and an end to the practice of discrediting the Russian Federation's legally elected bodies of power and government. [applause]

I call on all citizens and deputies of Russia, all peoples, all republics of our union to combine their efforts and by concerted actions to achieve the fulfillment of the abovementioned conditions. [applause] Taking account of the contemporary condition of the economy, what is proposed on the basis of the government program is of an anticrisis nature; I mean the Russian one. It contains a package of emergency measures, which are directed at obtaining results in a short time. In the sphere of food production it aims to satisfy the demand of all citizens for allocating land to them with maximum speed; to transfer the necessary land for market garden partnerships; to allocate land to all those who wish to plant potatoes and vegetables; to organize the first farms this year. [applause]

A resolution of the council of Ministers gives the right to solve these questions locally by executive committees for one year and to complete the preparation of the necessary laws quickly. Among these measures are also the following:

It is necessary to immediately introduce in the republic the indexation of prices for agricultural produce, materials, and machinery being received by collective and state farms and by private farmers. The parity of prices between industry and the countryside at the level envisaged in elaborating the decisions of the second extraordinary congress on regenerating the Russian countryside must be preserved as far as possible. [applause]

The government should in the shortest possible time complete work on economic liability measures for stopping deliveries of equipment and material resources to agricultural concerns. It is necessary to pursue the development of contracting with a wide application of reciprocal sales of equipment, fertilizers, and consumer goods. A significant proportion of commodity resources should be allocated to this. All restrictions on freedom of trade in agriucltural produce and incentives for setting up trade and purchasing cooperative and private enterprises for trade and delivery of agricultural produce to cities should be lifted. Immediately to begin the formation of several maximally specific economic programs, such as bread, mixed feed oil, and so on [sentence as heard]. Each one of these should represent a batch of clear measures and proposals for implementation and all

in all form a wide system of state orders in the implementation of which state enterprises, cooperatives, private traders, and international companies may take part.

In the field of social policy it is necessary to review immediately the adopted social programs with a view to a more purposeful and concentrated use of the allocated resources in the following directions: incentives for personnel training directly at enterprises, with the appropriate expenditure items being exempted from taxation; allowances for enterprises which use the labor of young specialists and pensioners; increases in the minimum wage level at enterprises; a lowering of the tax rate on earnings; incentives for the creation of new workplaces with above-average earnings; the creation at the republican and local levels of funds for the protection of low-income citizens; the provision of urgent measures for the development of the health service, including medical insurance [as heard]; the legislative registration of a list of socially important goods and services, and of the level of minimum consumer budget for specific zones of the Russian Federation; the introduction of indexation of spending and money deposits in relation to a price-rise index; the redistribution in favor of the low-income population strata of allowances toward rents, municipal services, and heating fuel; the creation of a housing market; the privatization of housing and, on the basis of this, an increase in the volume of construction; for the purpose of social protection of low-income families, the known allocation of up to 20 percent of newly-built housing at preferential rates.

It is proposed to implement a number of other social programs.

In the field of the budget, it is possible to preserve neither the adopted RSFSR budget nor the Union budget and the budgets of other republics. We must, after realistically assessing the situation in terms of income and expenditure, raise the question of the elaboration of an emergency budget. The budget must be prepared for a three-month period, and in its expenditure section, protected articles must be singled out, which will be determined in absolute sums, to be recalculated in accordance with the growth of prices. These articles must cover health protection, education, pensions, benefits and compensation to the population for retail price rises. The rest of the articles must be determined as shares of the income received, minus the expenditure involved in covering the protected articles.

In the field of credit policies, it is necessary to take the most urgent measures in order to create a banking mechanism to control over the amount of money in circulation through interest rates, reserve requirements, and other similar mechanisms. The work must go on to develop a network of commercial banks, specifically, by transforming specialized state banks.

In terms of incomes, in the tax regulation of the expenditure on payment for work, it is necessary to switch to a more flexible mechanism of regulation of the part which covers costs of production, taking into consideration the rate of inflation. It is also necessary to introduce a tax which regulates the growth of average wages instead of regulating consumption funds. All categories of workers represented by trade unions or departments must be compensated for the fall in their real incomes mainly through increased wages and salaries, implemented as a result of talks and the conclusion of agreements. That is, we need to create a mechanism of talks on the issues of wages and salaries with the participation of trade unions and strike committees, as well as representatives of entrepreneurs and the management of enterprises or state bodies. The proposed measures are on the whole, oriented toward moving ahead to a market economy, and they have a predominantly economic character. They are aimed at protecting the population and the main life-support system from the most destructive consequences of the crisis.

A few words about the work of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The republic's legislature has 10 months' experience of work behind it now. By historical standards this is not very much. A whole range of important legislative acts has been adopted, including acts to create the legislative bases for new economic relations, the development of entrepreneurialism, and the formation of market institutions. As the referendum showed, these initiatives are supported by the people. They also stimulate the Union legislature to take more radical and consistent decisions.

Of course, there have been omissions and serious errors in the work of the Supreme Soviet for a number of reasons, both political and organizational. I, too, bear a share of the blame. People have been particularly disturbed by speeches I have made allegedly in circumvention of our policy and of the congress' position. I can state firmly that I have not departed one step from the positions and decisions of the First Congress of People's Deputies and that I do not intend to depart from it. [applause]

In current conditions considerable corrections need to be carried out in our work. I shall discuss some of the measures which can increase its effectiveness.

First, efforts should be made for greater constructiveness in our work. Priority should be given to questions of the economy and the social life of Russians. The existence of dozens of parliamentary groups is a normal phenomenon. Frequently, however, the interests of groups and parties push those of the state and the people into the background. Some deputies have not managed to start off as real legislators. The various members of the presidium clearly bear different loads.

Second, in the Supreme Soviet it is necessary to gradually move the center of gravity to organizational and monitoring work. It is necessary to include in the process of ensuring the implementation of Russian laws the whole of the corps of deputies, the courts, the organs of justice, the procuracy, internal affairs, and the mass

media. The majority of our laws are to the advantage of enterprises, ordinary people, and society. It is not necessary to impose them, but it is undoubtedly necessary to explain them.

Third, the extraordinary nature of the economic situation requires us to adopt an extraordinary work regime. Evidently, certain corrections must be made to the structure of the Supreme Soviet. It should be an organ which at this time actively participates in the implementation of the anticrisis policy and effectively promotes the stabilization of the situation in the republic.

It will probably be necessary to set up temporary groups or commissions of deputies to resolve the republic's most acute problems. I consider it necessary that the principle that a member of the republic's legislature should, as a rule, be released from his main work must be settled once and for all at this congress. Another reason why I consider this question important is that it is intolerable and even criminal, I would say, when a meeting of the Supreme Soviet is frustrated because people's deputies are absent from sessions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. [applause and cheering]

The presidium must analyze the work of the chambers, the commissions, and committees, and discuss the results of this work at a session—maybe two sessions—of the Supreme Soviet. Of late there has been a whole lot of talk to the effect that the presidium lacks any serious powers. This myth must be decisively dispelled. The right to monitor the observance of the Constitution and the laws of the RSFSR, the right to revoke decisions taken by lower-ranking soviets and many other rights granted by the Constitution and laws of the RSFSR unambiguously testify to the broad powers of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet. Let us respect it rather than just discredit it. As part of its controlling functions the Supreme Soviet can study this or that decision of the presidium and, if necessary, amend it.

There has been considerable controversy over the budget of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. Yes, indeed, our budget does appear impressive at first glance—27 million rubles—when you bear in mind the changes in the whole system. [shouts from the floor] But—yes, millions of rubles. A different picture emerges, however, when you make comparisons. A total of 100 million rubles is allocated from the Union budget for the maintenance of the USSR president's staff. The USSR Supreme Soviet gets 110 million rubles. Over 40 million rubles are allocated for the staff of the Cabinet of Ministers. When you assess the parliamentary budget, you need to bear in mind that the role of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the system and volume of its work have fundamentally changed.

But it seems that there are reserves for reducing these expenditures as well, and we should be thinking about this. A lot of unfavorable criticism has been addressed to the organs of the soviet. The wait-and-see policy adopted by its party organization is also affecting its work. I think the time has come to deal with the problem of separating the loyalties. The specialist engaged in civil service should have only one task: to serve his own state and his electorate. [applause]

I think that a more detailed analysis of the Supreme Soviet's work will be more pertinent at the next Congress of People's Deputies, even if it is only based on one year's results, but also bearing in mind that you have certain information on this question. The most important direction in the work of the deputies' corps is building a law-governed state. Unfortunately, the law has been often used as a means for intimidation politics. Moreover, there were no impediments to the violation of legal norms if the immediate political interests demanded it. Actions were often based on the pinciple of revolutionary expediency. We now face a choice: Either use the law the way we did before—as a familiar, handy, so to speak, material—or renounce the all-consuming revolutionary destruction and begin to improve the legal mechanism, gradually forming a respectful attitude toward the law. I am convinced that we should unequivocally choose the second path.

The so-called war of laws has proved this once again. It is time to frankly admit: It is difficult to fight using something which does not yet work, or is working in a rather insignificant way. That is precisely how the Russian and Union laws are at the moment. The real reason for such a so-called war is the absence of demarcation lines in the spheres of competence between the center and the republics—the center exceeding the powers granted it by the USSR Constitution of 1977. There are many examples of this. But as soon as the republics attempt to use the defensive measures envisaged by the Constitution, the noise is immediately made about the war of laws. In reality, there is no war of laws. There is a war against laws, against law. [applause]

Such a war is indeed in progress, but it has been going on, not for one year or two, but for many decades. It is simply that recently legislative bodies—soviets at various levels—have involved themselves in it, something that had not happened previously. And this is no accident. The system of soviets, in the form in which it has existed in our country up to now, was possible only in the presence of a unified vertical structure of power such as always represented by the party. When this supporting structure became rickety and was no longer able to prop up the sham soviets, these bodies of power proved insufficiently capable of discharging their functions of authority. From the outset they had simply not been designed for this.

The soviets are provoked into going beyond their own remit by their own powerlessness, thus stoking up the so-called war of laws. It is possible to overcome the powerlessness of the soviets by two methods: The first one is to restore the party's monopoly on power, something that certain well-known forces are endeavoring to do, pushing the country back into the past; the second is to make a choice in favor of a real division of powers,

something that will require a substantial reorganization of the soviets and an in-depth reinterpretation of their role within the system of state bodies. It is important to set up a system or checks and balances. The essence of such a system lies not in each body of authority acting autonomously—that is impossible—but in a process of mutual control among them, one excluding the predominance of any particular body of authority and exluding tyranny.

The formation of a new system of authority in Russia has already begun. This process, however, is proceeding in extraordinarily difficult conditions. What is particularly valuable, therefore, is a division of powers of authority on the principle of cooperation and greatest competence among all those participating in it. The political struggle, in all its violent and non-constitutional forms, must be stopped.

Deputies and leaders of administrative bodies at all levels must perceive themselves not only as political figures, but also, above all, as state figures. It is time for soviets at all levels to stop waging wars of laws in an attempt to hide their impotence. The war of laws has become a cradle for what has come to be known as the parade of sovereignties. It must be said in all responsibility that the roots of the parade of sovereignties grow not from the declaration of state sovereignty by the RSFSR—as some frequently try to portray it—but from the USSR law on division of authority between the Union and the subjects of the federation, which was passed in April last year in the crudest violation of the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of the Union republics.

At that time, no one had even thought about a declaration of RSFSR state sovereignty or a new chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. It was precisely that law that laid down the basis for the disintegration of the Union republics which contain autonomous entities. Under these conditions, one of the main tasks of the declaration of RSFSR state sovereignty was to confirm the unity of the Russian Federation and to ensure its state integrity. The declaration was an act of protection of the Russian state. [applause]

It was the center that launched a parade of sovereignties on the territory of the Russian Federation, and it is trying to shift the entire blame for this onto Russia. For the sake of objectivity it must be admitted that both the leadership of the Russian Federation and I personally have committed a number of errors. In the struggle to influence the autonomous entities, we dragged ourselves into competition against the center in handing our sovereignties. But in this competition, there can be no winners. [applause] In the strategic dimension, the center, Russia, and the autonomous entities are equally losers, everyone. It is time to stop.

There is still a chance. The logic of getting out of the blind alley is obvious and clear. It is set forth in the proposed draft declaration about the main bases of the national and state organization of the RSFSR. Russia should reach agreement with its republics, and the center should assist rather than hamper it in this. Only along this road will we achieve a renewed Union, whose strength and stability will be based on the variety and flexibility of forms of national self-determination, with an effective system of democracy and a free economy without bounds. The republics and local authorities must give up the power tactics of boycotting the Constitution and laws of the Russian Federation. Russia, in its turn, takes upon itself the duty to observe rigorously the laws of the USSR issued within the powers handed over to the Union. The Russian leadership should treat more attentively and respectfully all the peoples of Russia, pursue dialogue and cooperation on the basis of equal rights, and respect the laws they adopt.

The terrible, destructive force of legal nihilism afflicting citizens and legal cynicism afflicting the authorities has always operated in our society. The preference given to the right of the strong rather than the force of law is a reflection of how the public continues to view the law. Much as it saddens me to acknowledge this, it will remain this way for a long time yet. A kind of legal inertia is at work here. What kind of inertia is this?

First, the principles that everything not permitted is forbidden and that whatever is permitted is mandatory, have been operating. Citizens were shackled in their actions by the universal passion for banning things. This also applied to the economy and people's private lives.

Second, even the proclaimed rights of citizens were systematically violated by the authorities, and people were deprived of judicial ways of defending their rights.

Third, there were specific instances of summary prohibition—for example, in registration—and administrative favors in allocation of housing and places at kindergartens. All this placed citizens in the humiliating position of supplicants toward the state. Naturally, therefore, people have no faith in the law. They do not know it and do not want to know it. Today there is a serious danger of a sharp escalation in legal nihilism—and, what is more, in the very near future. The law is more and more frequently an irritant to various political forces because it impedes the realization of their schemes.

But if we are abandoning totalitarianism in favor of a law-based state, it is essential that we unreservedly adopt the principles of such a state: the division of powers and inviolability and freedom of the individual. We must admit that power must be limited by the law and embark without delay on creating specific mechanisms for the defense of citizens' interests. We must start moving away from the law of the barracks, which regulates every step that a person takes, toward laws that give freedom of choice. With barracks law and the emergence of a partocracy, the party apparatus, which has surrendered the notorious Article 6 for form's sake only, is not even

considering giving up its monopoly on power. Its influence on legislation is still very great.

It is a fact that in our country there are currently 535 laws and other normative acts adopted by the supreme organs of state power and administration in the USSR which retain references to party policies and other similar transferred bodily functions of the infamous Article 6 of the Constitution. [applause]

Of these, 167 were adopted during the years of perestroyka. All this is one of the results of the merging of the party and the state, which lasted decades. Having built the party on a pseudo-democratic, militarized basis, its creators introduced a totalitarian basis into every field of state and public life. The party apparatus has been and remains the main force resisting the breakup of totalitarianism.

Very practical questions arise. What should the legal system of a free, democratic Russia be? What should the road of transferring to a new legal system be? How do we ensure its stability?

The legal system should become a true system and not a patchwork quilt of normative acts. Our legal system should be as full as possible; that is, it should not leave gaps in the law. Of course it is very difficult to achieve this. For this reason I would describe a minimally sufficient legal system which can be achieved fairly quickly as a realistic demand for today.

Furthermore, our legal system should become clear to the population. How ever paradoxical this may seem, it should also become understandable to lawyers. Finally, the legal system should become internally noncontradictory. The number of delegated legislation acts should be reduced to the greatest possible extent. The enormous number of delegated legislation acts that exists today is a direct road to perverting the spirit of the legal system. We can note as our early gain the fact that in this respect the ratio of government decisions to legislative acts of the Russian parliament has visibly improved for the better. It has gone down by a factor of five, by the way.

What are the possible alternatives for developing a legal system in conditions of republican sovereignties? The first alternative is a hierarchical legal system—Russia's laws in every case are above the laws of its constituent republics. But we have already been down that road and have attained the well-known results. There is another alternative. I would call it the inverse hierarchical alternative. The republics declare that their laws are always above Russia's laws. That is precisely what we are observing now and the results are also deplorable. Neither of these alternatives has any future.

It is easy enough to say that our law is supreme, but this does not mean that a fair, ideal, and effective legal system can be achieved in this way. The new legal system must be based on treaty and constitution. By means of treaties we must determine the principles on which the legal system is based and then enshrine these principles in the basic law, and define the procedures by which the laws of some republics are applicable on the territory of others, as well as the mechanism for maintaining the internal balance of this legal system in such a complex republic as Russia. On the basis of a clearcut, detailed demarcation of powers within Russia a system must be introduced by which Russia's laws will prevail on all questions assigned to the jurisdiction of the RSFSR, and republican laws will prevail, in their turn, on matters assigned to the jurisdiction of the republics.

I consider that the time has come to create an interlegislative committee tasked with harmonizing legislative policy in the republics which form part of Russia. Furthermore, it is expedient to give some thought to the creation of a completely new body, a Russian juridical commission. This should include not only legislators, but also authoritative specialists on the law. The prime task of this commission would be consultation. I am convinced that no one's sovereignty would be infringed by the advice of good specialists. Another task is to organize and hold talks between the republics on the harmonization of legislation, in other words talks on the internal organization of our own law reform.

A president of the RSFSR will be a new and, quite evidently, important factor in a reinvigorated law-based system. His powers and activities will be exercised within the framework of the Constitution and the laws and will, therefore, be limited by law. On the one hand, the president should not have the opportunity to take over the role of the legislative body or to apply pressure on it. On the other hand, he should receive certain constitutional means of exerting influence on the legislative system. He should have the right to propose candidacies for membership of the supreme judicial bench, the right to submit a program of activities to the legislature, the right of executive power, a mildly suspensive veto on the legislature's laws, which can be overturned by a majority vote in each chamber, and some other rights.

A president elected by the population will become, in a sense, a guarantee of the unity of the multinational state and thus of the unity of its juridical system. Protection of the rights and freedoms of the citizens will become one of the president's main responsibilities. Under the political and economic conditions that have developed, the presidency must become one of the important instruments for ensuring the sovereignty of Russia and protecting its interests in relations with a center that is still far from law-governed. Apart from that, we will need to create workable mechanisms for resolving disputes and getting rid of contradictions among regulations, as well as working out the procedures for dealing with disputes.

A special role here should be played by the constitutional court. We do not require from the republics that constitute the Russian Federation that their legislation should copy ours. They must have their own, individual, if you like, legislation, although it must certainly be agreed

upon and coodinated with the all-Russia legislation. The problem of creating a non-contradictory juridical system has an external aspect to its as well. The Russian juridical system must be fitted into the Union one. It must be coordinated with the juridical systems of other republics. Here, the principles must be also regulated by treaty.

Perhaps it would make sense to think of the establishment by the Union republics of an interparliamentary committee on legislation, similar to the one I have already suggested for the Russian Federation. Unfortunately the attempts by the Russian legislature to coordinate its activities on drafting laws with the Supreme Soviet of the Union have proved unsuccessful so far. The majority of the drafts of the Union laws are not being agreed with the Russian Federation, even if they are within the joint competence of the Union and the republic. Moreover, the plan of the Union's work on draft laws, approved by the president, has become secret recently, although it is of immediate concern to all the republics.

The courts, public prosecution bodies, and the militia must become the most important guarantees of the democratic character and of the fairness of Russia's juridical system and, at the same time, the instruments which ensure its efficient functioning. The improvement of the juridical foundation of their activity, as well as the strengthening of their financial, organizational, technical, and personnel basis, must constantly remain within the range of vision of Russia's legislature and Government. The system of law enforcement bodies which we are creating must be built according to the functions it should carry out in a law-governed state, and not according to the deplorable traditions of Soviet history.

The activities of the law enforcement bodies throughout the years of Soviet power were perverted. Their main task—the defense of human rights—was never fulfilled in practice. On the contrary, they were instruments of mass repression and the means of suppressing freedom and dissent. Unfriendly attitudes toward the law enforcement bodies and non-acceptance of them as defenders of the law has taken firm root in our people's consciousness. According to public opinion polls, more than half the citizens do not believe that the law enforcement bodies can reliably protect them. To restore the genuine role of the law enforcement bodies will not be simple and will take time, but it has to be done. I think [80-second break in transmission] of the basic law. We have to restore the universal human values—freedom, democracy, and law; renounce the anti-values—totalitarianism, militarism, and violence; and reaffirm people's faith in [passage indistinct].

Today the young people are at a social disadvantage. Their standard of living does not correspond to their contribution to the economy, science, and culture. At the same time they are free of the agonizing fear of the broken mechanism. They have not yet had time to accumulate grievances against the drawn-out process of perestroyka and can become a major factor for change.

Today we clearly understand that the revival of Russia will come first of all through the self-realization of the new generations who are free from ideological fetters and who will help to continue the new political course in order to bring Russia to the new stage of its development. In connection with this we should first of all formulate RSFSR legislation on youth that will embrace all the legal aspects of the young people's life and their organizations.

Second, we should remove the restrictions on the young person's ability to provide for himself and his opportunities to invest the money he has earned in liquid assets and property. Our success in private farming will come only through young hands, with the mass entry of young families into the farming business. We should give them the green light and direct help. Students should be able to do any work that does not interfere with their studies, including being able to earn money to pay for their studies in the fee-paying educational establishments. Restrictions on the size of residential property which they are building themselves at their own expense should be lifted—for young families first and then for everyone.

Third, the reform of public education should be completed in light of the projects which the Russian Government has developed, and thus provide each young person with the choice of the type, place, and level of his education.

Fourth, we must give scope to youthful entrepreneurial drive and make it possible, by all the means available to the state, for young people to get started on entrepreneurial activities, including training courses abroad.

Fifth, part of the revenue from state taxation on the profits of commercial ventures run by young people should be channelled toward the establishment and development of a social service on youth affairs. The whole of society has a duty to assist and help young people, especially those groups which find themselves in difficult living conditions, like the disabled, orphans, ex-prisoners, and so on. The state will provide material support for social services for young people which are being set up by the public. Nevertheless, the state's role in this must be limited.

Sixth, in Russia we must make arrangements for a civilian service as a partial alternative to military service. There is no reason to fear that the Army will be left without soldiers. Civilian youth service should also be regarded as a way of solving the problem of unemployment.

Seventh, in its youth policy the state must directly rely on the young generation. We must establish a permanent dialogue with youth organizations and movements of various types and orientations and make sure that their initiatives are given legislative expression.

Esteemed people's deputies, the revival of Russia will only take place when culture is given back the role it deserves in the life of the people. Unfortunately, there is never enough space left in our reports for this subject. Nevertheless, I would like to devote some time to this theme, which is indeed a relevant one. A utilitarian attitude toward culture has unfortunately already come into being. A policy which gives priority to material production has taken pride of place. The result of such an attitude manifests itself in a highly destructive way; namely, the merging of our spiritual and material existences, intolerance of anything which is different, unconventional or unaccustomed, and the spreading of indifference in terms of spiritual values.

The secondary role which has been artificially imposed on culture has resulted in the hearts and minds of millions of people being extensively taken over by various myths and prejudices. An entire generation of people has been made to believe that fairy tales will definitely come true and that a content society can be created through destruction. The distortion of spiritual values has reached colossal proportions. The great precepts which make up the foundations of culture and spiritual life have been called into question.

They were replaced by artificial structures and false values. Today we understand how much we have lost. Shortages in culture means shortages in humanity, goodness, wisdom, tolerance, and competence. Shortages in culture are manifested not only in people's attitudes toward each other, but also in attitudes toward their own history and the history of other peoples, in attitudes toward their own state and other states. Today we are badly short of experience to restore lost positions in the world. The fact that for a long time only power factors were used for this and that only in such cases did we achieve temporary successes shows that colossal work lies ahead for the cultural renaissance of our Russian society. It is precisely because Russia is not going through the best of times that we have to work out new attitudes to culture. I would like to say sincerely that it is not easy to perceive culture as a value in itself, to understand that its development is in fact the renaissance of the people.

We consider the main tasks of cultural policy to be the following:

1. To strengthen in every possible way the cultural sovereignty of citizens, societies, and peoples. Man should be entitled to his individuality. The main wealth of the country is not simply its people, some kind of labor resources, but the creative abilities of each man and of everyone together.

2. Financial support for culture, especially in noncommercial areas, institutions, and their staffs. Our main concern today is to find additional resources for the implementation of this task, including sponsorships and tax allowances for all economic subjects which show concern for culture.

3. Socio-legal support for culture. The legal basis for fulfilling this function could become a republican law on culture meant to record its special status and employees' social and creative rights, and regulate the relations between culture and the authorities.

In the present circumstances it is especially important to single out a number of priorities the implementation of which would most fruitfully affect the cultural renaissance as a whole. The following could be included here: democratization, humanization, and technical refurbishment of secondary education; development of pure, natural social sciences and humanities; modernization and development of libraries and museums; restoration of cultural monuments; rebirth of language, national customs, traditions, folklore, and artistic crafts of the peoples of Russia; technical equipping and humanization of the republican television and radio and other mass media; and the providing of housing and normal living conditions for cultural figures, first and foremost creative workers in arts and sciences.

Of course we are striving to be realistic and understand that in the immediate future the situation in the field of culture is not going to change radically.

But I am sure that we can offer more than keeping culture at a survival level. If this becomes a norm, the further degeneration of the Russian multinational culture will take place.

Finally, esteemed people's deputies, while thinking about our problems and trying to determine practical ways of solving them, I consider it possible and pertinent to talk about Russia's place in the international community. The modern world civilization has entered a new stage of its evolution and has developed principles of life which could be recognized as universal for all humanity. The most important of these are the recognition of the priority of human rights, the civilized organization of the market economy, and social justice and social protection of each member of society.

From the outside the present situation looks like the defeat of one system and the victory of the other. Nevertheless, we should not feel ourselves defeated. The painful process of our return to the international community has already started. The idea of social justice, the affirmation of spirituality—these are all our ideas. It was Russia that introduced them to the world. Without our tragic history the present state of world civilization would not, probably, be the same.

Today it is necessary to strive for a world order where the countries will not be divided into great and small, influential and second-rate, where the rights of each man, wherever he lives, will be put first, rather than the interests of certain countries or groups of countries. Humanism has ceased to be an abstract principle. It is gradually becoming a norm of human life, a factor in world politics. This is being achieved not only by declarations. First of all, however, it is necessary to appreciate these problems at the level of their depth and magnitude.

I think that we can and should act in accordance with this understanding and these principles and strive for the fundamentally new place which the revived Russia will take in the world community, in accordance with its possibilities, traditions, and culture.

Russia used to be, is, and will continue to be great, both by virtue of its geographic position, as a bridge between Europe and Asia, and by virtue of the size and diversity of its population, its wealth of natural resources, and—most important—by virtue of its inexhaustible spiritual potential and very rich history. The status of a so-called superpower, compliance with which has drained our Russian economy, the stress on military force, and the striving for political domination should remain in the past. We want to see Russia as an influential member of the international community, with its standing based on reborn economic might and moral and spiritual purity.

We are leaving behind us military pressure on anyone at all, political intrigue, strong-arm methods, ambiguities, and whispers. Today this may sound a little lofty and naive—I am about to finish—but this is the truth, and we are convinced that thereby we are taking a step into our future. We see three principal characteristics of our state, our Russian society:

1. Non-interference of the state in the internal affairs and life of communities, except in cases of violations of human rights.

2. Consistent removal from ideological control of all state institutions of Russia.

3. Demilitarization of all areas of society, except the preservation of integral borders and maintenance of Union Armed Forces at a sufficient level.

It is impossible to ensure the Russian Federation's full value in the international community without the widest possible access for every layer of society to the achievements of humanity and without the fullest implementation of international human rights standards.

Esteemed people's deputies, in conclusion I would like to note the following. In the life of every one of us and of society as a whole much depends on politicians, their views, abilities, competence, and experience. Crucial issues of the country's present and future are decided by the supreme bodies of authority elected by the people. But however the situation may turn out, in every case the people always have the final word. The loss of the people's confidence is the heaviest punishment, for the highest leader, for an elected body, and for an ordinary deputy alike. It means political death. The people are free, however, and able to provide both the greatest degree of (?protection) and the strongest possible support. Russia's corps of deputies stands out through the fact that we were all elected by the citizens of the republic; each of us was entrusted with the voters' confidence. So let us work in such a way as to come up to their expectations, both in the present and in our future. Thank you. [applause]

TASS Reports Highlights of Yeltsin Address

LD2903182591 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS—Russian parliamentary chairman Boris Yeltsin today called for "a coalition government of popular trust and national accord" to be formed immediately in the Soviet Union.

Delivering a state-of-the-republic report to the Supreme Russian legislature—the Congress of People's Deputies, he proposed a package of political and economic reforms.

Yeltsin called for an early treaty on a union of sovereign states as a federal voluntary association of equal nations, and for new federal bodies to be created.

He urged round-table talks among all political forces and professional associations in all republics, suggesting that the Russian Congress initiate this kind of dialogue.

Yeltsin called for the "real departisation" of prosecutor and other juridical services, the KGB, the Army and the state apparatus, from which all party cells should be removed.

He criticised the results of perestroyka, contending that "what we have been witnessing in the past six years was not restructuring but rather the last phase of the stagnation period".

Yeltsin declared his firm intention to consolidate Russian economic sovereignty. This will be done, according to him, by:

—Making certain that the rouble is viable,

—stabilising the solvency of money through a harder line in the field of finances, and cutting the budget deficit by maximum possible margins,

—fashioning new market structures to ensure supplies of resources to various economic sectors,

—granting real economic independence to enterprises,

—privatisation,

—extensive land reform.

Yeltsin argued for an executive presidency in the Russian Republic as "a new factor in its legal system", saying that the chief executive should be "an instrument for protecting Russia's interests in its dealings with the yet far from rule-of-law centre".

He said work should continue on a new Russian constitution, which should be "absolutely deideologised".

Yeltsin said that "updated Russia should take up a fundamentally new place in the world community". The republic, he said, "was, is and will remain great due both

to its geographical position as a bridge between Europe and Asia and to its ethnically diverse population and natural wealth".

"Banking on military force and the striving for political domination should belong to the past," he added.

Yeltsin's report concluded the day at the Congress. Earlier the deputies were able to approve its agenda after lengthy debates.

The session will continue on Saturday.

Moscow TV Program Details 29 March Session

LD2903232191

Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 2045 GMT on 29 March begins carrying a program entitled "Third Extraordinary Congress of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies" which comprises recordings of the proceedings of the congress at the Kremlin in Moscow on 29 March.

Khasbulatov, chairing the session, says that there is a determination that Moscow's militia will remain Moscow's militia. He goes on to discuss the agenda. It is intended to finish the Congress within five days.

Deputy Chelnokov says only RSFSR deputies and invited guests are entitled to be in the hall. Deputy Kharitonov objects to yesterday's proceedings and votes. Unqualified deputies were reported to have voted. Vasin then speaks on procedure. A deputy from Tyumen Oblast suggests that the agenda be adopted forthwith as agreed by the coordinating committee. He complains of a forged document that has been circulating. A deputy from Volgograd says power needs to be spread fairly between the subjects of Russia.

At 2105 GMT Khasbulatov takes a vote on coordinating committee's agenda. It is adopted, but there seem to be some objections. Deputy Denisenko from the Kuzbass demands that the miners' demands be considered by the congress. Deputy Chernyshev asks for a separate vote for each item on the agenda. Deputy Bulygin complains of the slowness with which the agenda issue is being settled. A deputy from Moscow Oblast answers a charge that he was not entitled to vote.

Khasbulatov takes a vote on accepting the agenda as a package. It is adopted.

A deputy from Volgograd then says that yesterday the coordinating committee agreed that the results of the referendum should be discussed as part of the discusson of the republic's national state set-up. Khasbulatov then reiterates the four questions on the agenda that has been agreed. A deputy demands the right for the congress to hear a co-report on the situation in the republic. Another deputy speaks of the coordinating committee's work yesterday.

Deputy Sokolov says he still insists that the agenda include the results of the referendum. Another deputy asks that Comrade Isakov be allowed to deliver a co-report. He says he was one of those who called for this extraordinary congress.

At 2127 GMT Khasbulatov announces an interval for an hour.

At 2128 GMT the afternoon session opens with a report by Novikov on the work of the coordinating committee on the agenda. Three questions are being put on the agenda, but there are differences over the wording of these questions. The deputies will need to vote on these.

Khasbulatov takes a vote on the wording for item one of the agenda. A vote will be taken on whether there will be a co-report. Yes, there will be a co-report or co-reports. A vote is then taken and it is decided that there will be two co-reports.

At 2138 GMT Khasbulatov takes votes on the other issues on the agenda. Deputy Varov says each deputy has the right to raise an issue and have a vote taken.

Khasbulatov then takes a vote on Deputy Varov's proposal that the question of the RSFSR Presidency be included on the agenda. The proposal is not adopted.

A deputy from Murmansk at the start of the evening session complains that the chairman had during the afternoon sitting infringed several Congress procedural rules. He demands a return to consideration of the rally in Moscow yesterday. Deputy Osminin complains of queues for bread. Deputy Gerasimov calls for work to begin on the agenda: Let us hear Yeltsin's report. Applause from deputies.

A deputy from the Kuzbass speaks of the need to settle the strike issue so that the miners can get back to work. A deputy from Archangel thanks Khasbulatov for helping bring viewpoints closer together this morning. A deputy from Vladivostok says the question of the presidency needs to be settled.

At 2154 GMT Khasbulatov takes a vote on whether Golikov, representing the Kuzbass workers, should be allowed to address the congress.

Golikov then speaks at the rostrum. He says the miners' talks with the Union government over the past two years have yielded no results. He wants Russia to become a real sovereign state. He decries the fact that the deputies have left the question of the presidency off the agenda and have thereby ignored the will of the people. He says that the Union legislature was not elected democratically and cannot resolve issues.

At 2159 GMT a deputy wants Yeltsin to deliver his report and to begin work on the agenda.

Khasbulatov proposes a vote on whether the congress should finish on 2 April, but the vote does not materalize. Khasbulatov then takes a vote on whether Yeltsin

should be given one and a half hours for his report and then 20 minutes be allocated for the co-reports. It is adopted.

Deputy Zakharov proposes that tomorrow morning the deputies listen to Yeltsin's report and then brief co-reports be heard.

At 2209 GMT Khasbulatov proposes a vote on whether Yeltsin's report should be postponed till the morning. The proposal is not adopted. Deputy Shustov proposes a vote on whether Yeltsin's report be at the start of the television broadcast of today's congress proceedings. The deputies approve of this by a hand vote. Then the program ends.

RSFSR Congress 30 Mar

Moscow TV Continues Coverage of 30 Mar Session

LD3003234291

Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1845 GMT on 30 March begins broadcasting a recording of proceedings at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow on 30 March. Registration takes place, and a quorum is declared present. On a procedural point, Deputy Zudilov proposes that Yeltsin be given time to answer questions.

At 1900 GMT Deputy Zadonskiy speaks on procedure, saying territorial groups lack unity and so should not make collective applications. Deputy Toborkov then speaks, wanting more time allocated to Yeltsin. Deputy Denisenko reads a message from striking miners disillusioned with the congress. Deputy Alekseyev proposes that Yeltsin be given only 30 minutes.

At 1905 GMT Deputy Maykov says there is not time for everyone to speak. He wants Yeltsin to spend 40 minutes answering oral questions. "Ultimata" have wasted time, he says: The broadcasting of the congress has been "arbitrary." Deputy Kharitonov supports full television coverage of the congress.

A vote is taken on ending questions. The motion is passed. A vote is then taken on allowing Yeltsin to reply to questions. The motion is passed. A vote is taken on how much time to give him; nothing is decided.

A deputy complains that the chairman is not sticking to procedure; another makes procedural suggestions. A vote is taken on whether questions should be written down—it is decided that they will be both written and oral.

At 1919 GMT Yeltsin replies to written questions, received earlier. Some, he says, are very long. Slobodkin asks if the congress will discuss the Tarasov case. Yeltsin replies in the affirmative. Yeltsin then rejects a written question on accusations that he is bringing about the collapse of the Union. Deputy Vedernikov asks about laws that ignore social and economic facts. Yeltsin denies them. Deputy Zasukhin raises the question of dissolving the congress and holding new elections. Yeltsin says the congress should not be dissolved.

At 1932 GMT Deputy Tarasov asks how local power will be improved. Yeltsin replies that the Supreme Soviet is to blame for not passing law on this, and that the presidency issue should be settled. A direct secret ballot would strengthen power, he says.

At 1940 GMT Deputy Sanbykov wonders why, after visiting mining regions, Yeltsin has done nothing to solve the miners' problem. Yeltsin replies that decisions were incompletely implemented. He recommends that miners come under RSFSR jurisdiction instead of the Ministry of the Coal Industry. Deputy Anikin then asks: What about the food shortage? He asks what the emergency budget would do for the miners. Yeltsin replies that the food commission has been hard at work, and that Silayev reported to him while he had the flu. Emergency measures were already mentioned in yesterday's report, he says—the miners are within their rights, though their action destabilizes the country. Yeltsin says he has visited the coal regions and been down the mines. Miners' living conditions are appalling, he says—to that extent one can understand the miners. Pavlov was asked to start talks with them at once, but he has not done so. Yeltsin says he is willing to take part in talks if Pavlov so wishes.

At 1949 GMT Deputy Ruppel asks when Yeltsin will visit Tyumen Oblast. Life there is hard, he says. Yeltsin replies he has promised to visit Tyumen, and will do so.

At 1952 GMT Deputy Grambin speaks on the audit commission, which awaits proposals. Deputy Guryevich from Murmank Oblast remarks on the difficulty of chosing one speaker when the oblast is evenly divided on important issues.

At 2000 GMT Deputy Zakharov takes the floor, and apologizes for Deputy Meshustina not having gotten a chance to speak. There is prolonged uproar. Meshustina is then heard—she complains that procedures were violated when she was prevented from speaking yesterday. She feels deeply about Isakov, who has been badly treated. Her constituents, she says, voted to remove Isakov—he should not deliver a report, as there is no confidence in him.

Zakharov again urges a constructive approach, and begins a report on an assessment by Presidium members of Yeltsin's report. The chairman is entitled to express his own view, he says. He denies that the Presidium took no part in preparing the report. A clear new ideological stance needed, he says. The period covered by the report was only nine months of fruitful work; much was done in a short time. It is all very well to find fault, he says—the congress must make decisions that cannot be made elsewhere. The congress must approve radical changes in the distribution network and structure of the national economy, he says, and military spending must be cut

drastically, as it amounts to about 200 billion rubles. Cut it this year by 20-30 percent, he urges. The budget is not the one Russia needs. Who is preventing the implementation of good laws? Sabotage is being done, says Zakharov. Land reform failures are to be laid at the door of the localities—they are not the fault of Yeltsin or Silayev, he says. Law reform demands attention, and must be backed up by strong sanctions. The structure of power has many shortcomings of an organizational kind, Zakharov concludes.

Deputy Isakov speaks on the successes and failures of reform. Populist measures have been calculated for instant effect, he says, and pluralism and a new degree of freedom have been achieved. Yet the general situation has deteriorated, with growth of chaos and crime, he says.

At 2055 GMT the deputies vote to meet tomorrow, Sunday 31 March.

At 2058 GMT Deputy Zakharov answers questions on social guarantees for workers, pension justice for workers in northern regions, Union property on RSFSR territory, military spending the legality of an Isakov article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, education, and agricutural prices. Deputy Yaroshenko asks a question about war veterans' pensions and pensions paid to those who have "never done a day's work." Zakharov says such people do not get pensions. The veterans will get higher pensions than under Union law.

At 2115 GMT Isakov answers questions on his disagreements with Yeltsin, why he votes against land laws he helped to create, an expression of no confidence in him, why has he sold off Russia's shipyards by signing the Union treaty, the decision on Baltic representation, and his disrespect for the people's opinion.

Deputy Khrulev is called on to speak. He says he did not hear anything in the reports providing an answer to Russia's socioeconomic problems. Local soviets must have more real power, he says. The voters must not be cheated, allowing the question of a presidency to drop. The power structure must be revised, he says. Isakov and his friends seem to want to deny the results of the referendum, says Khrulev—on behalf of his constituents, he expresses support for Yeltsin.

At 2141 GMT the recording of the afternoon session ends.

At 2142 GMT deputies register for the evening session. Isayev is in the chair. He reads a note—Is Silayev to speak? The answer is yes. There are 794 present after another call to register.

At 2146 GMT Deputy Lapshin is called to speak. He is concerned at the lack of progress with land reform and introduction of varied forms of ownership. Political battling is distracting us from the real economic problems, he says. The development of farming needs proper finance. The necessary laws for farm development are not being discussed. Everyone should have the opportunity to have land to work. The failure to implement decisions on farming is tantamount to violating the law, Lapshin concludes.

Deputy Dashev, an eye surgeon, contrasts ethnic problems in the United States and Russia. Nations want freedom to live their own way, he says—all republics and regions must be equal entities within the federation. National ambitions need to be kept within bounds. A chance to move to the market was missed five or six years ago, when we still had discipline, says Dashev, and goes on to talk about charitable services to those with eye troubles. Yeltsin's program contains what is essential—freedom and free enterprise, he says—we must take the opportunity and stick with Yeltsin's program.

At 2203 GMT Ivan Silayev, RSFSR prime minister, is called on to speak. He begins by noting the funds allocated to agriculture. Funding is in accordance with congress decisions, he says. The main reason I asked to speak is to describe the economic reform program, says Silayev. Our basic argument is that we have depended on a smooth transition from the planned to the market economy, and now we are suffering from that miscalculation. We have been too reluctant to lose our economic virginity, he says. Our plan of action is first that the right conditions have to be created for producers of goods; taxes on manufacturers must be reduced. We do not intend to let all foreign currency income continue to be handed over to the Center, says Silayev—enterprises must be given their independence. The government will continue to support large complexes that have ceased to come under its budget. Small enterprises will be encouraged, and people will be encouraged to earn spare cash by income tax reductions, he says.

Prices must be free, says Silayev, to encourage production. Compensation can be paid where necessary. Investment must be encouraged, including investment from abroad, he sais. Partial convertibility of the ruble would help entry into the world market. Silayev says that lack of technical resources is largely due to the state order system. Foreign suppliers of machine tools and agricultural equipment must be allowed into the market, so that we will become more competitive, he says. Distribution of property is a topical matter needing decisions by the congress. Help is needed to implement the decision on taking enterprises in the RSFSR under republican control instead of Union control, says Silayev. The RSFSR government would like to conduct its own customs policy, and is ready to discuss this with the USSR Cabinet of Ministers. Freer access to foreign currency is needed, he says, and modern banking facilities should be developed independently of the USSR Gosbank. Changes in the way the budget is run should be introduced from 1992, he says.

Small-scale privatization, says Silayev, must proceed, including encouragement for peasant farms. In the sphere of conversion, we offer cooperation in develping

the production of consumer goods, including tax benefits. Where possible, military and civil enterprises will be kept separate. In the sphere of science and technology, we have a specific program, which we are ready to implement, he says.

On the miners, Silayev says the government has discussed taking several mines under RSFSR jurisdiction. As Russian citizens, he says, we cannot leave the miners to their poverty; they are our citizens and we must be concerned for them.

Now we have presented our program, Silayev says, and with a modicum of support, especially as concerns customs duties and foreign currency, we are certain we shall succeed. Silayev ends his report at 2228 GMT.

Deputy Sheynis speaks for the social democrats and the republicans. He says there was no need for Communists to force the convening of this congress, but that they can help to see that some good results from it. Resolute measures are needed, he says, to strengthen the authority of the RSFSR's power structure. Sheynis supports Yeltsin's call for a roundtable to form a coalition government. He argues that competing forces in Soviet society must come together to hammer out the future of the country.

Next, Deputy Yekimenko says she was not among those calling for a congress, but she is glad it has been convened, because it means people have had to declare their positions, and the voters can see who they voted for. Blocking of a presidency debate means the congress has put itself above the Russian people, she says. She asserts that while Isakov may have left the party he talks like a party apparatchik. She also warns of Goryacheva, claiming her voters have expressed a lack of confidence in her. The referendum result was a call for effective Russian sovereignty, she says. Yeltsin is not to blame for the slow pace of reform, but rather those who are afraid of a presidency.

At 2255 GMT, Goryacheva, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, makes a "political statement": I used to believe in Yeltsin and his program, and supported his first steps, she says. But gradually, I have begun to doubt. There are many words, but few practical deeds.

Goryacheva recalls Yeltsin's 4 January agreement with Gorbachev calling for harmonized prices policy. Goryacheva then lists what she terms contradictions in Yeltsin's statements. He is unpredictable, she says. Yesterday's report called for strict observance of the law, but as chairman, Yeltsin has been usurping some of the powers of the supreme soviet, she says.

Goryacheva also claims Deputy Kopeyko organized a slander campaign against her in the media in Maritime Kray, and started a campaign to have her recalled as a deputy. She says her 70-year-old mother-in-law could not take the stress and entered the hospital.

A deputy from Leningrad speaks on a point of order.

Isayev then says it is time for other business and gives the floor to Basin. Basin notes the number and nature of messages which have arrived for the congress and reminds deputies of some of the standing orders.

At 2318 GMT, Deputy Volkov recalls his request for miners to speak. Deputy Baburin asks why USSR people's deputies who do not support Democratic Russia are not allowed into the hall.

Isayev next gives the floor to Peruanskiy, who suggests some of the proceeds from the 5 percent sales tax be earmarked for their pensions. Deputy Rossokhin speaks on behalf of war veterans who are losing part of their living space, which is classed as excess when their children leave home and their wives die. Deputy Yegorov takes the floor, criticizing the lack of attention to the questions of laws in the report.

Deputy Sayenko takes the floor, complaining of Yeltsin's failure to reply to his questions, which he sets out. Deputy Khudinova then takes the floor, to ask why they have met to hold a rally if the main point is to get the republic out of crisis. He criticizes Isakov and Goryacheva for their attacks on Yeltsin and says her family has received threats, like Goryacheva's.

At 2341 GMT, Isayev says the session has ended.

Deputies To Discuss Yeltsin Report on Reforms

LD3003073391 Moscow TASS in English 0719 GMT 30 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—It is planned to devote the third day of the Extraordinary Congress of Russian People's Deputies to the discussion of Russian parliament leader Boris Yeltsin's report. At Friday's session of the congress, Yeltsin set out a programme of political and economic reforms. The main political demand of the report is that Union bodies of power be replaced and Russia's independence from the centre be strengthened.

A tough battle is certain to be launched at the congress over Yeltsin's proposals. Quite a number of parliamentarians do not agree with the policy of opposition to Union bodies, which is pursued by him. It is they who called for convening the present congress. The supreme body of the republican state authority should act as an arbiter.

Vladimir Isakov, one of the six leaders of the republican legislature who issued a statement denouncing Yeltsin's policy in the run-up to the congress, is expected to made a second report at the congress today.

Mikail Zakharov, a representative from the Democratic Russia movement, which brought Yeltsin to power, will also deliver a report today.

Yeltsin Answers Questions From Deputies

LD3003094491 Moscow TASS in English 0932 GMT 30 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—Russian parliament president Boris Yeltsin today rejected his political opponents' accusations that he was seeking to break up the USSR.

In response to deputies' questions in connection with his report, delivered at the third extraordinary congress of people's deputies of the Russian Federation on Friday, Yeltsin recalled, to corroborate his stand, that in his report he had put forward "a number of additional specific constructive proposals aimed at consolidating the union and at signing a new union treaty as soon as possible."

Yeltsin described as a "normal phenomenon" the existence of various political factions and groups in Russia's deputy corps.

He said he opposes the dissolution of the Congress of Russia's People's Deputies. (Some deputies believe that in the event of a new election, the political portrait of the congress would be more monolithic).

Many questions asked by deputies concerned Yeltsin's attitude to the coalminers' strike in a number of regions of Russia and coalminers' political and economic demands. Yeltsin described the coalminers' strike as an "expression of the coalminers' will, to which they have a right, although this is an extreme measure which, of course destabilises the economic situation both in Russia and in the country as a whole".

Having briefly decribed the hardest social conditions in coal producing areas of the republic, Yeltsin reaffirmed that the Russian leadership was prepared for a transfer of the coal industry to Russia's jurisdiction. "Economic problems will be removed as a result of that, and only political ones will remain," he added.

Radio Rossii Reports Answers

LD3003150191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Report on answers by Boris N. Yeltsin to questions posed by deputies at the 30 March session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic extraordinary third Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—monitored in progress—recorded]

[Text] [Deputy Zasukhin from Kamchatka] Boris Nikolayevich, assuming the Supreme Soviet has split for political reasons, what do you think if a large group of people's deputies advocates dissolving the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and setting new elections so that our electors, lacking a law on a recall of deputies who do not perform well, can really elect representatives chosen by the people, so as to extricate ourselves from this political impasse?

[Yeltsin] I am against dissolving the congress today.

[Deputy Tarasov] Boris Nikolayevich, would you say something about the ways in which local authority can be improved?

[Yeltsin] The Supreme Soviet is guilty of not having fulfilled the instructions of the Congress of People's Deputies and of not yet having passed a law on the local soviets and local self-government defining quite clearly the full extent of the power of the local soviets. If the Congress of People's Deputies decides the issue of the presidency and accordingly appoints a time and procedure for electing a president of Russia, then after those elections we can make a decision that a congress of chairmen at all levels—from the rural, settlement, rayon, city, oblast, and republic levels—should also be elected by all the people of that territory by direct secret ballot. That would strengthen power.

[Studio reporter] Boris Yeltsin was also asked questions about the miners' strikes and how to resolve the situation that has arisen.

[Yeltsin] Ivan Stepanovich and I discussed this issue together. We do not object to the miners leaving the Minsitry of Coal Industry and coming under the jurisdiction of the Russian federation. Their economic questions, especially the questions of independence, which are in the forefront today, will be settled without delay. Now it is up to the miners.

[Deputy Anitkin] Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, at the last congress you were confirmed as chairman of the emergency committee on food. I understand that it is difficult to answer this question after such a short time, but perhaps you could give some details about this in your concluding remarks? Yesterday you expressed the very interesting idea of a possible emergency budget of the republic for this year. Is there such a program and of what does it consist? What place does it give to the miners? If they strike for another seven or 10 days, there will be no question of any budget. In general, what are your feelings about this strike?

[Yeltsin] First let me refer to the emergency commission on food that was set up at the second extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies. The commission has been working regularly and constantly, discussing questions and hearing reports. The supreme Soviet has been notified regarding emergency measures. They exist, and they exist in the government. As to what you call the participation of the miners in this, I consider that this is the expression of their will. They have a right to it, although it is an extreme measure and of course it destabilizes the economic situation both in Russia and in the country. But these questions are probably being asked by those who have never been down a coal mine or visited a miners' settlement. [applause] I have been in

both. In Vorkuta I climbed along a drift of about five kilometers, and I have been to the Kuzbass and looked at the barracks—you cannot even call them barracks—in which the miners live, where in the winter the temperature in the housing is 10 degrees. Despite the decisions of the Union government, those decisions are not being carried out. They have voiced their demands once, twice, three times, four times, and still they are not being carried out. In that respect, one can understand the miners. It is intolerable. We are willing to take part in those negotiations. If Pavlov thinks it necessary that the Council of Ministers of the Russian federation should take part, Comrade Silayev is willing to take part in this. If the Russian federation can play some part in this, we are willing. We have expressed our wish that if the miners accept the proposal, we will accept them into the jurisdiction of Russia and remove the economic problems. The political ones will remain. [applause]

[Deputy Ruspel] Tyumen oblast provides the country with three- quarters of its foreign currency, yet leads a pitiable existence. Do you consider it necessary that world prices should be adopted for raw materials, oil, gas, and timber?

[Yeltsin] Yes, I am in favor of adopting world prices for raw materials with absolutely all consumers, including the republics within our Union, in the course of this year.

[Ruspel] A second question: Do you intend to visit our oblast and help solve its problems?

[Yeltsin] Well, You know, I have already traveled through more than half of Russia, but all the rest are aggrieved that I have not visited them yet. I have promised the people of Tyumen that I will visit, and I will do so. Thank you.

Moscow TV Carries Answers

LD3103132891

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1919 GMT on 30 March carries a 30-minute recorded report on the answers by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin to questions from deputies, both written and in person, at the 30 March session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) extraordinary third Congress of People's Deputies.

Yeltsin says: "I received questions put in writing last night and this morning also—last night after the report, of course. Let me—many questions are very long—set forth the essence of the question and not read the entire question. For example, People's Deputy Slobodkin asks whether the congress will discuss and tackle inquiries by the USSR procurator general with regard to the people's [break in reception].

You are familiar with the decision of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and it is not the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet who makes decisions on the Congress of People's Deputies, but the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. It is you who decide. Yes, we will take turns. Further [word indistinct]."

To a question by Deputy Lisin from Nizhniy Novgorod on the rejection on political grounds of the candidature of Zoya Afanasyevna Kornilova for the post of the chairman of the committee on nationalities, Yeltsin says: "As for Zoya Afanasyevna, I think it would be simply unethical to answer this question now. It was tackled collectively. It was not tackled by someone alone or by two people, but by the Presidium and so on. It was resolved collectively and in line with our regulations....

"Just one moment. Now there will be a written question. [Yeltsin reads] Taking into account the fact that you are accused by some people of pulling down the Union, do you think the program you put forward can seriously facilitate the consolidation of the renewed democratized Union of the republic?

"I answer: First, I have already answered this question many times accusing me of pulling down the Union, and I have never heard a specific question [as heard] in return to the question as to what this consists of. What precisely do my actions of pulling down the Union consist of? I do not accept this accusation. A number of specific constructive proposals were put forward yesterday in the report for strengthening the Union and for the speediest signing of the Union treaty."

To a question by a Leningrad deputy on Yeltsin's attitude to commercial activities of some deputies and members of the Supreme Soviet, Yeltsin says: "My attitude toward this is negative. People's Deputy Vedernikov says that page 3 of the information and reference leaflet says a number of issues laws are being adopted without taking into account real social and economic potentialities. The question is, first: What laws specifically has our Supreme Soviet adopted without taking into account economic potentialities, namely, empty and good-for-nothing laws? It is also being asserted there that the activity of the Supreme Soviet Presidium exceeds the powers given to it. The second question is: Why does the Presidium exceed—this is a continuation—its powers when there is a constantly working Supreme Soviet? The first question regards laws being adopted without taking into account economic potentialities. No such laws have been adopted. Yes, it is true, the issue of [word indistinct] of social protection of Russian population has been discussed during recent days and is still being discussed. There is talk during the discussion at the Supreme Soviet about, first, a 40-hour work week, about the minimum wage being 135 rubles [R] for all categories of citizens, about the minimum vacation being 24 work days for all categories of citizens, and in regard to increasing compensation for temporary disability."

Yeltsin continues: "During discussion of this issue, the minister of finance spoke and said that these things had not been calculated, or rather, there were different estimates. Our Committee for Social Protection has one

figure, around R2-3 billion, but according to the Ministry of Finance estimate, it is R40 billion. Both the committee and the RSFSR Council of Ministers have been instructed to sit down and make a precise calculation of what the program is going to cost. For the time being, no decision or law has been adopted on this."

Yeltsin continues: "As far as the Presidium is concerned, it seems to me that in the legal section of my report yesterday, I stated fairly clearly what the Presidium's rights are. Many believe these rights to be purely notional, as it were. No, under the Constitution the Presidium has a sufficient amount of rights. Thus, the presidium acts within its framework of powers. Moreover, if the question arises—and it could—the Supreme Soviet can react immediately and revoke a decision of the Supreme Soviet Presidium."

The session chairman then calls for microphone No. 3, from which Deputy Zasukhin, from national terrritorial constituency No. 44 in Kamchatka, asks: "Boris Nikolayevich, both the congress and the Supreme Soviet have split for political reasons. Many laws, both social and political, fail to pass. At this very congress we have successfully demolished the law on recall of people's deputies. What do you think: If a large group of people's deputies backs the dissolution of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies, we could set new elections so that in the absence of a law on recall, our voters could elect genuine representatives of the people to this body so as to extricate ourselves from this political impasse? Thank you." There is applause.

Yeltsin replies: "I will answer the first part of your question on the draft law on recall of people's deputies. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet is to blame for the fact that a law on this has not yet been passed. The discussion and adoption of a fairly sizeable law at the Congress of People's Deputies would double the time needed for our proceedings. My personal view is that it is not worth having this law debated and passed at the congress. However, it is essential to discuss and adopt it at one of the first sittings of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. Regarding the existence of various political groupings and groups of deputies, public and sociopolitical groups, and so on, it seems to me that this is a normal phenomenon, although certain political groups are leading to destructive actions, and we must appeal to them to act in a certain spirit of consolidation so that we justify the people's trust. I am against dissolving the congress at this point."

The session chairman then asks Yeltsin to answer a written question.

Yeltsin says: "This question is from People's Deputy Sturov: In the transition to the market, the former northern autonomous okrugs, in particular Evenki Okrug, have found themselves in the worst predicament. Huntsmen, reindeer breeders, and geologists are living, or rather existing, under the most difficult and extreme conditions. The Committee for the North, chaired by Komarov, was set up. It is not on top of the situation today. It either cannot or does not want to give real assistance. Decisions adopted by the government have not made the situation any less acute. Please explain what additional steps you propose to adopt to pull the northern autonomous okrugs out of their critical predicament, Deputy Sturov asks.

"My answer is: The Committee for Social Matters has drawn up not so much amendments as additional proposals to a number of drafts dealing with social matters for the peoples of the north. That is the first point, and this is going to be considered at the Supreme Soviet session. Second, I think that, bearing in mind the really acute nature of this, we need to hear a report on the committee's work from Komarov, the chairman of the committee, at the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet."

The chairman then calls for a question from microphone No. 4, at which Deputy Tarasov from territorial district No. 600 asks: "Boris Nikolayevich, in your report you noted with complete justice the shortcomings of the present local soviets and their executive bodies. Could you please tell us in more detail about the ways in which local authority could be improved?"

Yeltsin replies: "Understood. Well, obviously time does not allow me to go into much detail; but if I compress it, then it is possible to say the following: First, the Supreme Soviet is guilty of not implementing the instructions of the Congress of People's Deputies and not adopting a law on local soviets and local self-government that would clearly define the full extent of the power of local soviets. For this reason the Supreme Soviet, after the congress and once it is in session, taking into account that a draft resoluton is now completely ready and approved with many, if not the majority, of local soviets in the provinces, must introduce, discuss, and adopt this law.

"Second, I consider that if the Congress of People's Deputies is to decide the issue of the presidency and accordingly appoint the time and procedure for Russian presidential elections, then after these elections it would be possible to adopt a decision that all chairmen at all levels, beginning at the village, settlement, aul, rayon, town, oblast, republic, and other levels, should also be elected by all the people of any territory by direct, secret ballot. This would increase authority." There is applause.

The chairman then asks Yeltsin to answer a written question.

Yeltsin, turning to a written question, says: "I earnestly entreat you, asks People's Deputy Bobikov, I earnestly entreat you to answer when will the pensionable age of tractor operators, milkmaids, pigherders, and other farm workers be reduced?"

Yeltsin replies: "I spoke about the committee introducing addenda into the law on pensions—the Russian

law on pensions—and it is proposed to include this question in these proposals."

The chairman thanks him and asks for a question from microphone No. 5. People's Deputy Ketinkov, from territorial district No. 257, asks: "Boris Nikolayevich, in your report you constantly referred to the government program. I understand that this is the program that has been distributed to us all. I have a question. By whom, how, and when will this program be confirmed? What time frame is proposed for beginning its implementation? Further, what bodies are proposed to guarantee its implementation, since a specific time frame is indicated here for implementing it?"

Yeltsin responds: "In the first place, this program is being implemented after the rejection of the Shatalin-Yavlinskiy 500 Days program. The basic principles have been being implemented all this time. But by instruction of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the RSFSR Council of Ministers was instructed to try to find solutions by 15 March so that such a program can be drawn up for one republic, that is for the Russian Federation, although earlier, and even now, the majority of theoretical economists consider that it is impossible to have different separate, unconnected programs for various republics with one Union market area.

"It is also impossible to live without a program. For this reason such a compromise version, as I would call it, of the program has been prepared by several groups. I believe six groups worked on it; right, Ivan Stepanovich? Six groups worked on the preparation of this program and then tried to link up and take the best from all these six groups. As a result, this program is submitted to you. Yesterday I gave out not only individual additional sections of this program, but also the political conditions under which it can be implemented. Control over the implementation of this program is mainly carried out by the RSFSR Council of Ministers, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies, and all soviets in the provinces."

The chairman once again asks Yeltsin to answer a written question.

Yeltsin says that People's Deputy Sandykov notes Yeltsin's trip to a number of mining regions, the Kuznetsk Basin, and Vorkuta in the summer of 1990. The deputy asks why measures were not taken to develop the social sphere and resolve economic issues. He wants to know which bodies are charged with checking on the questions asked in the course of Yeltsin's visit.

Yeltsin replies: "The point is that the Communist Party Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, and so forth have adopted decisions, both on the Kuznetsk Basin and Vorkuta as well as on approximately 40-50 regions of our Russian Federation. Unfortunately, these decisions have only been fulfilled by 10, 15, or 20 percent. Therefore, it is necessary to go again along this repetitive path and adopt decisions on each difficult region—and the Russian Federation has 88 regions, all of which are difficult.

"I have recently visited Kaliningrad Oblast, Yaroslavl, Novgorod, North Ossetia, and Checheno-Ingushetia need decisions. This is not the right path. Therefore, it was recommended that the miners can shift; and we and the government, together with Ivan Stepanovich, have discussed this matter. We do not object to the miners leaving the Ministry of Coal Industry and coming under the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation. Then their economic questions, especially the questions of independence, which are in the forefront today, would be settled without delay. Now it is up to the miners."

Following applause, the chairman asks for the deputy at microphone No. 6 to speak. Deputy Anitkin from the 10th national-territorial constituency asks: "Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, at the last congress you were appointed chairman of the extraordinary commission on food. However, you did not find the time to report on the work of the commission at the Supreme Soviet, although we asked you many times about this. Also, little was said about this in your report yesterday. I understand that it is difficult to answer this question after such a short time, but perhaps you could give some details about this in your concluding remarks?

"One specific matter that I request that you answer now is that yesterday you expressed the very interesting idea of a possible extraordinary budget of the republic for this year. At the same time, in my opinion, a republican extraordinary budget is impossible without extraordinary emergency measures to stabilize the economy. In connection with this, is there such a program? What does it consist of? What place in it is allocated to the miners? If they strike for another seven or 10 days, there can be no question of any budget. What are your feelings about this strike? Thank you."

Yeltsin answers: "First, as to the extraordinary commission on food that was set up at the second extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies: It has been working regularly and constantly, discussing questions, hearing reports, and dealing with regional issues where a crisis point has already been reached, for instance in Yaroslavl Oblast, which provides 23 oblasts with flour for baking bread. Enough flour remains for two days. This is a matter for the extraordinary commission. By discussing it, the extraordinary commission has found a solution to this matter.

"The Supreme Soviet has been informed about the work of the extraordinary commission. You are not correct here.

"Yes, when the report on the extraordinary commission's work was planned I had the flu. Others reported for me. Ivan Stapanovich Silayev, the deputy chairman of this commission, gave a report. But if you consider it necessary to speak in more detail about the work of this extraordinary commission, then I will. I do not object.

There is something to speak about. Just bear in mind that concluding remarks are not a second report.

"Further, with regard to extraordinary measures: First, I expressed these extraordinary measures yesterday in the report, albeit in consise form. Of course, that was not the whole list of extraordinary measures. But they exist, and they exist in the government. As to what you call the participation of the miners in this and what my attitude is, I consider that this is the expression of their will. They have a right to it, although it is an extreme measure and it destabilizes the economic situation both in Russia and the country. But these questions, nonetheless, are probably being asked by those who have not been down a coal mine or visited miners' settlements."

After applause, Yeltsin continues: "I have been in both. In Vorkuta I climbed about five km along a drift, and I have been to the Kuznetsk Basin and looked at those barracks—you can not even call them barracks—in which the miners live, where in the winter the temperature in the housing is 10 degrees [not further specified]. Despite the decisions of the Union government, those decisions are not being carried out. They have voiced their demands once, twice, three times, fives times, and still they are not being carried out. In that respect, one can understand the miners."

After applause, Yeltsin continues: "The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet has made a decision to propose to Pavlov, chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers, that he immediately initiate negotiations with the miners. Then what is this? Pavlov's personal caprice? He has so far still not initiated these negotiations. Yesterday? Oh, I apologize. He initiated them yesterday, did he? I was mistaken."

The chairman asks for a written question to be answered, but Yeltsin continues: "I hope he will do as he has promised. We have made a decision on immediate action. This issue is taking hours and days to resolve. A week has passed, and a second week is already in progress. This is intolerable. We are willing to take part in the negotiations. If Pavlov thinks it necessary that the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation take part, Comrade Silayev is ready to take part in this. If the Russian Federation can play some part in this, we are willing. We have expressed our wish that, if the miners accept the proposal, we will accept them into the jurisdiction of Russia and remove the economic problems. The political ones will remain."

There is applause. Then Yeltsin reads a written question from People's Deputy Ruspel from Tyumen Oblast, which, Yeltsin notes, provides the country with three-quarters of its foreign currency. He says that this oblast is suffering a miserable existence. The chairman comments that this will be the final question.

Yeltsin continues reading the question, which says that oil workers, gas workers, and other inhabitants of the oblast who are working under difficult Siberian conditions live in barracks and eat bread and potatoes. The deputy wants to know if Yeltsin considers it necessary for world prices to be adopted for raw materials, oil, gas, and timber.

Yeltsin says: "I spoke about this yesterday in my report. Yes, I am in favor of adopting world prices for raw materials with absolutely all consumers, including the republics within our Union, in the course of this year."

There is applause. As Yeltsin begins to move to another question, the chairman reminds him that the previous question was supposed to be the last. The chairman allows Yeltsin to answer whether he intends to visit Tyumen Oblast and help solve the problems facing it.

Yeltsin says: "Well, you know, I have already traveled through more than half of Russia, but all the rest are aggrieved that I have not visited them yet. I have promised the people of Tyumen that I will visit them, and I will do so. Thank you." There is prolonged applause.

The chairman thanks Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin for his answers.

Miners' Telegram Criticizes RSFSR Congress

LD3003112391

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian at 0900 GMT on 30 March carries a five-minute report on proceedings at the 30 March session of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies in Moscow, with correspondent Olga Vasilenko.

Vasilenko says:

"According to the agenda, the deputies were supposed to begin listening to the first supplementary report at 1000 today. Let me remind you that it was decided by a vote yesterday that the first to speak will be Zakharov, chairman of the Commission for Social Policy, and the second will be Isakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Republic. But questions rained down: how deputies were meant to register to speak, let Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin answer questions first, and then we can have the supplementary reports. Bella Denisenko, a deputy from the Kuzbass, forced her way through to the microphone and passed on what miners had told her on the telephone this morning. They had sent her this telegram, and it was here in the Kremlin: by ignoring the will of the people expressed during the referendum, the congress has not justified our hopes."

After an intervention from the studio presenter, Vasilenko continues:

"Then, all the same, they voted for Yeltsin to answer questions, and not to have the supplementary reports. They gave him 30 minutes. I cannot say that the questions were distinguished by a certain amount of profundity, although they were interesting. For example, here is Lisin's question—he is the leader of the "Russia" group:

the question of the appointment of deputy Kornilova from Yakutia, Zoya Afanasyevna Kornilova, to the post of chairman of the committee for nationalities affairs was debated back in the fall. I know this deputy very well. She is a most serious economist, a doctor of sciences. I am saying this for myself. And then the question ran: she was told that she was unsuitable for political reasons. Yeltsin considered it unethical to answer that question, especially, he said, as that matter was settled on a collegiate basis, collectively, in accordance with the standing orders.

"Then Serdyukov asked a question: what is your attitude to the commercial activity of some members of the Supreme Soviet? Yeltsin's answer: My attitude is negative.

"Another question: if a group of deputies puts forward an initiative to dissolve the congress, in order to get out of this political deadend, and to elect new deputies, what will you say? The answer was wholly negative. Yeltsin said: truth is born in the struggle between opinions, all the same, although there are indeed enough destructive forces at the congress, but I am against dissolving the congress.

"There were questions concerning Anton Mikhaylovich Tarasov and Gennadiy Innokentyevich Filshin—that's the 140 billion ruble affair—and an important question on the food commission. Yeltsin replied that only hot issues should be tackled for now."

Vasilenko mentions a brief intervention by a deputy who questioned Isakov's right to deliver a report. She goes on:

"That was an emotional outburst, which was followed by Zakharov's speech. He approved of Yeltsin's report, agreed with him on many points, developed individual tenets of his and expressed a whole se[illegible] of proposals on how to put those tenets into practice, but he said that, all the same, the congress has to settle the political question, the question of executive power, the question of the presidency; and if it is not possible to do that at the congress, signatures will be collected, and an all-Russian referendum might decide it, but that will greatly impair the authority of the congress. Besides this, he spoke about the intensification—well, he is a lawyer, and he stressed that the law is the obligatory norm for our conduct and legal instructions have to be backed up by strong compulsion."

Deputies Called on To Decide Presidency Issue

LD3003104191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0947 GMT 30 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar (TASS)—Mikhail Zakharov, member of the Presidium of the Russian Supreme Soviet, has called on the current Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies to decide the issue of introducing the post of president of the republic. The representative of the Democratic Russia movement delivered a joint report at the congress today, reflecting the position of the supporters of parliament chairman Boris Yeltsin.

The speaker supported all the main points of yesterday's report by Boris Yeltsin. Zakharov said the results of the republican referendum, in which a majority of the electors favored instituting a presidency, must be given legislative form by the congress. "If we do not manage to do this, another referendum will be held, and then the people will decide the presidency issue to the detriment of the prestige of the congress," he said in reply to deputies who object to this question being decided in haste.

Mikhail Zakharov urged that the system of executive power in the republic be strengthened.

On economic problems, the speaker singled out in particular the need to cut back military spending, which he thinks could already be reduced by 20-30 percent this year.

Isakov on Yeltsin; Suggests Gorbachev Step Down

LD3003120191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1100 GMT 30 Mar 91

[TASS legislative correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar TASS—Speaking at today's session of the RSFSR congress, Vladimir Isakov sharply criticized the activity of the Russian leadership and parliament chairman Boris Yeltsin personally, as well as the program for extricating Russia from the crisis, set out in his report yesterday at the Third Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies.

The chairman of one of the chambers of the Russian parliament delivered a supplementary report on behalf of the six leaders of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet who have expressed disagreement with Boris Yeltsin's course and demanded the calling of the present extraordinary congress.

The speaker stated that the latest events have confirmed the view of the "Group of Six" that "all opportunities for bringing the chairman of the Supreme Soviet back onto the path of realism" have been exhausted. In yesterday's report, Vladimir Isakov believes steps were taken along the path of exacerbating the confrontation.

He accused the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of "legal nihilism," "imperial manners," and "tactlessness in relations with the republics" in the RSFSR and of elaborating an abundance of programs and being incapable of seeing a single one of them through to the end.

Boris Yeltsin "is acting insincerely," pursuing his main goal: "the attainment of completely unlimited presidential power." "A new dictatorship is marching to the beat of the drums of demagogy," the presenter of the supplementary report said.

Vladimir Isakov specifically concentrated on Boris Yeltsin's efforts to lay the main blame for the situation which has developed in the republic on the union leadership. He agreed that the union leadership has taken many erroneous steps. "I am not a supporter of the language of ultimatum but, perhaps, Mikhail Gorbachev should really think of handing the role over into the hands of somebody else," Vladimir Isakov said.

However, while criticizing the center, according to his words, "you need to be objective also toward yourself." The Russian leadership itself, he stated, to a great extent had made for the growth of chaos by opening the war of laws, the banking war, and the budget war.

Naming the main reason for the negative processes happening in Russia, Vladimir Isakov said that "on the wave of democratization the people moved forward and came to power who neither in the moral nor in the professional respect are ready for state activity." "Coming to power is not happiness but a disaster for these new forces," he stated.

Radio Reports Isakov Criticism

LD3003200591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1233 GMT 30 Mar 91

["Supplementary report" by Vladimir Isakov, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of the Republic, to the 30 March session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic extraordinary third Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Deputies, in assessing the work of our deputies' corps up to now, I see both positive elements and shortcomings, both successes and serious setbacks. What can be included among the successes? Among our gains we can include, first and foremost, the general political course worked out by the congresses of people's deputies and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, the course leading to pluralism of property and forms of economic activities, a gradual transition to a market economy and a preservation of a high degree of social guarantees in the society. I think the most important thing we managed to do during this period is the decision on agrarian issues, which proceeds from a categorical inadmissibility and nonacceptance of a new cleanout of the peasants. On the contrary, to bring new life to the countryside [passage indistinct] of living, and on this basis to ensure food for the Republic, that's the only responsible statesmanlike approach to this complex problem. It is painful and disappointing to see how important decisions made by us are being watered down and broken up by thoughtless and ill-considered populist actions calculated merely for immediate success.

Among the undoubted gains, I would also include the fact that during this period the Republic has taken an enormous step along the road of democracy, glasnost and openness to the outside world. Political pluralism has appeared, pluralism of thought and word. The people have acquired a new degree of freedom which, I am convinced, it's impossible to move back from them. This is irreversible.

Regretfully, these necessary processes, which are beneficial to our society, have been accompanied by a general deterioration in the situation, an aggravation of political and interethnic confrontations, economic chaos and growing crime.

Society has reached a dangerous line, beyond which lie direct threats to the statehood of the Russian Federation. Disorganization and imbalance in the economy are growing. Disintegration of economic links between regions and enterprises is continuing, and the generation of national income is dropping sharply today by 5 percent, by the end of year it is expected to reach 1 percent. The capital construction program, especially in housing, health services and education facilities, has collapsed, and the supply of food and the provision of manufactured goods to the population has reached the limit of endurance.

I must disagree with factual aspects of the state of affairs cited in the main report yesterday. In the RSFSR, the scale of decline in generated national income, versus 1989, was not less, but three times greater than several other Union republics, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, and amounted to 5 percent against 4 percent in the USSR as a whole. The fall in labor productivity is also much more significant, 3.7 percent, versus an average of 3.2 percent throughout the USSR, and 0.4-0.7 percent in Belorussia and the Ukraine. That is, the crisis has hit the RSFSR not less, but more severely than other republics. It's not worth embellishing the state of affairs here. This can only cause a flare up of social tension in society.

Much of what is taking place is being blamed on the center—the USSR Government and the country's president—and of course there is an element of truth to this. The Union leadership has taken quite a few mistaken steps, which have worsened the crisis phenomena. Let us, for instance, recall last year's failed attempt to raise prices. The people are simply fed up with that kind of life. They no longer believe anyone or anything. They associate many errors and failures personally with the country's president. I do not favor speaking in terms of ultimatums, but perhaps Mikhail Sergeyevich indeed should think about handing over the steering wheel to someone else. [applause] I would not hesitate to vote in favor of entrusting him with any diplomatic post.

But, in criticizing the center and pointing out its mistakes and oversights, we should also be objective about ourselves.

We cannot fail to note that to a fairly large extent we ourselves have promoted the growth in chaos and the rise and aggravation of crisis phenomenon. First, we launched the war of laws, the banking war, the budget war, and now we are fighting along the entire front. We battled the center but it was our own people who suffered.

Despite frequent reminders and set dates, the RSFSR Government has so far failed to present to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet a plan for the social and economic development of the republic. Indeed, we apparently no longer are building communism. We got tired, we had enough. But, it does not follow from this that a time of purposeless existence has come for the peoples of Russia, that we are unable to set sensible objectives and establish goals which the republic should reach. This has not been done. Instead, the government has embarked on financial adventures, dubious deals, got down to building market Potemkin villages. Under the guise of market structures, new monopolists are being created, who, on top of it all, are equipped with extensive commercial powers and the right to free management of profits. For example, there are the privileged funds, of which we have recently cooked up quite a few. Soon there will probably be no enterprise left that hasn't taken cover under the roof of some fund.

Yesterday a report was delivered in which Boris Nikolayevich assessed the republic's economic and political situation, and projected a complex of measures for emerging from the crisis. What is my attitude to this program? I shall tell you outright. It is highly equivocal. The theme of the center's fault, which forms a leitmotiv of the whole speech, arouses objection and inward protest. We can do nothing, don't know how to do anything, cannot influence anything and consequently are not responsible for anything. How long can we go on like that? What are we, criticsf of the center of leaders of the republic, responsible for everything that takes place in it? [applause]

In the program, there is no clear economic policy. I have in part spoken about this when I spoke about hard currency speculation and market Potemkin Villages. I shall add at least one more trait. I cannot in the least agree with the stat ement that the current difficulties with food are an exclusive achievement of the aforementioned center, which did not buy grain for us from abroad. In normal years in Russia, with gross grain harvest of 127 million tonnes, the state used to stock up some 50 million tonnes. Last year, which was very favorable, with the same gross harvest, as a result of inaction and connivance by the RSFSR Government, and through its fault alone, only 34 million tonnes were stocked. Now, we are short some 15 million tonnes, which is exactly the amount which, acording to our chairman, the center owes to the republic.

The chapter of the report devoted to price policy arouses complex feelings. Again, there are many strong words and accusations against the center—it deceived, it failed to provide, it is pursuing policies directed against the people. One can perceive a desire to raise as high as possible the wave of popular wrath and bring it down on the adversary's head. But, who stands in the way of coordinating policy on this issue, of pursuing it together, especially as the agreement with the Union and with other republics was concluded at the end of last year? Should that be the position of a chairman who is really concerned about the people's interests? [applause] Esteemed Comrades, we can do without the applause.

The social policy proposed in the report is contradictory and confused. There are no other words for it. On the one hand, throughout the report there is indexation and compensation. On the other, completely free prices, including those for food and staple goods. On the one hand, there is a call for strict budgetary savings and cuts in budget financing. On the other, more and more expensive social programs in conditions when the old ones, ones we have already adopted, have not even started to be fulfilled. It is completely obvious that the existing budget will not be able to bear such expenditure. On the one hand, there is a transfer to a housing market. On the other, redistribution of rent outlays in favor of those with low incomes and redistribution of new housing on preferential terms. It would be interesting to know how these redistribution mechanisms are going to fit within the harsh conditions of a market economy.

Yesterday, the auditorium applauded the idea of a roundtable of political parties. It was said, although it took some effort, that even selected representatives from among communists could be allowed to sit at that table. I also find this ideas of a roundtable very attractive. Furthermore, I know that various alternatives to it have been under discussion as far back as last September. But, so far it has not been realized. It is probably not the table, but a lack of anything to put on it that's presenting the problem.

Like a true democrat, Boris Nikolayevich gave his due to the primary democratic sacred objects—freedom of speech, press, rallies, mass processions and demonstrations. But, give credit where credit is due, the program of anticrisis measures that he proposed is more realistic and to a greater degree takes into consideration the far from simple situation which now prevails in the republic. It provides for strict subordination of state bodies and greater responsibility for the observance of order and discipline.

A significant exercise was made in the report on issues of law. The faithfulness of the notion of a law-governed state to the ideals of human rights is confirmed. But how does one reconcile respect for the law and permanent discreditation of the prevailing constitutions of the RSFSR and the USSR? The preamble of our Constitution, its first lines, speak of resolve to establish a democratic law-governed state within a renewed union of

soviet socialist republics. Apart form irony and insults, we heard nothing in the report about a renewed union. A union does not suit Boris Nikolayevich, not even a renewed one.

And, how are we to treat his decision to send an RSFSR MVD [Internal Affairs Ministry] contingent to Georgia? This directly contradicts the decision of the second Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies on procedures for the participation of servicemen in interethnic conflicts. What else is this but the very legal nihilism of which Boris Nikolayevich spoke so angrily?

Issues of the nationalities policy are especially critical in our federative state. From this point of view, the idea of handing out sovereignties can hardly be regarded among the successful parts of the report.

Sovereignty cannot be given or withheld. The republics already have it. Now that they have gathered strength, the processes of national self-determination can neither be halted nor turned back. First, unconsidered utterances on the subject of sovereignty, and now insensitivity in relations with the republics, and imperious gestures will hardly improve reciprocal relations within the Russian Federation.

We can make a load of objections and observations on other sections of the reports on the work of the Supreme Soviet, youth policy, culture, they have been ideologized, isolated from specific problems and contain few new ideas. Not only I but many people had the feeling that advisers from the supreme consultative coordinating council have played a bad joke, using for the report their faded half-finished efforts for the 25th and 26th Congresses of the CPSU.

There is another element I must mention. At one time, Boris Nikolayevich used to severely criticize the Ryzhkov government for its wealth of programs and its incapacity to see even one of them through to the end. The same thing is happening here. Just recall, when Boris Nikolayevich was elected to the post of chairman, a first program was proposed. Then, in October last year, the 500-day program, a second one. Finally, on the eve of the second congress, the famous three alternatives, we can say a third one. Now we are being presented with a fourth program. I have the impression that I am sitting in some strange theater. The auditorium is full, the orchestra is playing the overture, people are clapping, but the curtain does not rise and nothing happens. The orchestra starts on the overture again, and again nothing happens. This has now happened four times.

What is going on? What are the reasons for such a strange evolution of events?

The main reason can be seen to be that on the wave of democratization that been proceeding in our society in a difficult and painful way, and with great delays, people have come to the fore, to power, who morally and professionally are not ready for state activity. The leaders of the democratic movement, Gavril Kharitonovich Popov, Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak and Boris Nikolayevich, evoke great personal sympathy. They are fighters and devotees of ideas. But just look at the difficulty and cumbersomeness with which their teams work. Whenever something crops up, there follows some convulsive reaction, democratic hysterics and attempts to seek shelter behind democratic phrases and to heap their failure upon some specific enemy. What childish helplessness, combined with unchildlike aggression, this is! In general, it is indeed possible to understand them, since they have a great deal of practice in organizing rallies, strikes and hunger strikes, and it is not easy to learn normal human living. Their accession to power is not a good fortune but a misfortune for our new forces.

Encountering recent criticism and mounting resistance in parliament, our democratic forces have moved along a far from democratic path. They have appealed to the people in an attempt to incite people, kindle passions and pressure state bodies, thereby to cling to power for some time longer. You do not have to go far for examples. Take, for instance, the work of our congress. Once again, we see infringements of procedure, pressure, the seizure of microphones, anger and attempts to deflect the congress from its discussion of the main issues and to lead it aside. Surely, it is clear that we shall achieve nothing by attempts to outshout and to bawl at one another, and shall never reach agreement on anything. I am shocked by how quickly people have been able to make us enemies.

But, there are no enemies of Russia in this hall. I am convinced of this. It's just that we see her future, and the paths to this future, in a different way, each in his own way. But all of us, I am convinced, I stress this, wish her well. Can we really not come to an agreement on that basis? Let's just listen to one another, and as far as possible, not see one another through ideological sights. That's all there is to it, nothing else is needed. In politics, there are methods and means which cannot be used without the threat of a great mishap. Today, these means have been actively set in motion. People are wound up, divided, pushed to the limit. Our duty, as the supreme organ of power responsible for the destiny of the people, is to stop the escalation of this conflict. What does the way out of the crisis situation appear to be?

On behalf of a group of people's deputies who are the authors of a political statement, I am submitting the following proposals. One, taking account of remarks and proposals voiced at this congress, to correct within the shortest timespan the program for stabilizing the economy, to restore its manageability, the RSFSR Council of Ministers is to elaborate and adopt an emergency plan to extricating the Republic from the crisis. Two, at this congress to examine and adopt a law for stabilizing the situation in the Republic and measures for strengthening order and discipline. We have drawn up a draft law, I am handing it to the Secretariat, and I ask the congress presidium to make a decision on duplicating

and circulating this document among people's deputies. Three, as a result of manifest abuses, to suspend - [shouts from floor] I ask literally one minute, I have to finish. [shouts from floor] As a result of manifest abuses, to suspend the force of the law on the referendum, leaving the right to set a referendum with the Congress of People's Deputies. I must tell you, esteemed people's deputies, that there is currently an application to hold a referendum on a further ten issues lying on the table of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. Unless we stop this hastily adopted law, which practice has shown to be not very well thought through, we shall never get out of a long line of referenda.

Four, we shall never cope with the big crisis, unless we overcome a small crisis, The split within our legislature. In connection with this we propose that we discuss and adopt at this congress a law on the rights and duties of the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Five, for the purpose of monitoring the process of legislative activity, the observance of procedures, the powers of state bodies, and limiting subjectivism, we propose that congress and Supreme Soviet procedural commission be elected with a significantly renewed and expanded composition and that it be granted specific powers.

I shall try to sum up. In our political statement we said that we exhausted...[interruption from the chairman] I need literally 30 seconds. I am asking for literally 30 seconds and I think i will easily fit within that time.

In our political statement, we said we exhausted or nearly exhausted all possibilities of returning the chairman of the Supreme Soviet to the road of realism. Regretfully, subsequent events have confirmed that our assessment was well founded. More and more steps are taken along the road of political confrontation. We are being sucked in deeper and deeper by the quagmire of economic crisis. Regretfully, at this congress, Boris Nikolayevich is not behaving sincerely. He is trying to get away from direct discussion and he is taking back some of his statements. All in all, everything for the main objective, totally unlimited presidential power. To watch how, hiding behind the most sacred words, to the sound of drums of demagoguery, a new dictatorship is marching up, and not to say so, is to commit a crime against the people, against your own conscience. We have said so. Think about it. Thank you for your attention.

Zakharov on Reduced Russian Military Contributions

LD3003135791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] Mikhail Zakharov, chairman of the Social Policy Commission of the Russian parliament, proposed that the contributions of the Russian federation to the Union military budget be cut by between 20 to 30 percent in 1991. He delivered a report at the morning sitting of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Congress of People's Deputies today. It is essential, he said, that the country's expenditure for the upkeep of the military- industrial complex amount to no more than between 6 to 7 percent of the GNP, that is, between 40 billion to 50 billion rubles. At present, according to the most conservative of estimates, the expenditure amounts to 200 billion rubles.

Yeltsin, Khasbulatov Interview Cited

LD3003153591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1349 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] We have just received a report on the exclusive interview that Yeltsin and Khasbulatov have given to the RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY. I will quote some fragments of these interviews:

Mikhail Gorbachev, while he is still holding the post of USSR president, should obviously take part in the work of the roundtable, said Boris Yeltsin to the parliamentary correspondent of the RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY. The idea of a dialogue on the principles of the roundtable was suggested in yesterday's report by Yeltsin. In the opinion of the leader of the Russian parliament, the leaders of the republics and repreentatives of all political parties and organizations should take part in the discussion in the course of which an attempt to find a solution to the critical situation existing in the country can be made.

Ruslan Khasbulatov, the first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, asked the same question by the correspondent of the RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY, thinks that the communists should be the first to sit at the roundtable because the Communist Party is the largest political force in the country. Its composition is not homogenous, added Khasbulatov. There are several trends that now exist in the party—from fascists to true Marxist communists. Representatives of all the existing parties and movements concerned about the fate of the peoples of Russia should take part in the roundtable. Ruslan Khasbulatov also touched on the issue of the miners. If the congress of the people's deputies had satisfied the demands of the miners even partially, he said, and had regularized the state power according to the will of the people expressed by the Russian referendum; if it had accepted the responsibility for the political, economic, and social fate of the country and decided on the introduction of the post of the president, we could have appealed to the miners to stop the strike. In such a situation I think, noted Khasbulatov, the miners would agree to compromise. One should not fool around with the striking miners, noted Khasbulatov, or threaten them. They, as well as all of our people, will not be intimidated by tanks or automatic guns.

I repeat that these were fragments of the exclusive interviews that Yeltsin and Khasbulatov gave to the RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY.

Moscow TV Sees 'Maneuvering' During Debates

LD3003191591 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent L. Khatayevich at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow on 31 March, including recorded excerpts of remarks by Deputies Zakharov and Isakov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Khatayevich] If one were to try to define briefly the situation that took shape at the congress today, I would call it a continuation of what happened yesterday. Yes, the congress has entered a new phase. The main report has been delivered. Practical work should begin. But even in procedural questions that would not seem to be of decisive significance unjustifiably acute discussions are starting. A confrontation is under way that I would not even call political. Maneuvering [lavrirovaniye] is under way.

Since morning, the question of work procedures has been decided in a situation that is unjustifiably acute. As a result, after frequent voting, it was decided to begin with Yeltsin's answers to the deputies' questions on the report he delivered yesterday. That procedure lasted just half an hour and bore, in my view, a formal character; because of the time limit he simply did not have the opportunity to give a deeper, more exhaustive interpretation of the paragraphs of the report. I will single out one aspect connected with the miners' strike and their talks with Pavlov, chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers. Yeltsin stated that the Government of Russia is ready to take part in these talks and bear its share of responsibility for their outcome.

Strange as it may seem, during the morning session the stormiest reaction was evoked by attempts to ignore the demands of the congress to give the floor to Deputy Meshustina, who in the words of one of her colleagues had been standing at the microphone since yesterday. [passage omitted]

Nevertheless, both Deputy Isakov and his colleague Zakharov, as was planned since morning, delivered their reports today. These reports were different, and perhaps it is these reports that make it possible to judge the degree of polarization of opinions that has taken shape at the congress, although the question on which—and we are forming an opinion on that—was not clearly designated on the agenda [as heard]. Nevertheless, here are two quotes confirming the thought that has just been expressed.

[Zakharov] Let us not delay resolving that question. If that is not done, then the consequence is clear. Many deputies have assembled here. Signatures have been gathered, and I think that they have already begun to gather them. A nationwide referendum will be held again, and that question will be decided, decided to the detriment of the authority of our congress. That must not be allowed. The question of the presidency ought to have been decided directly at the congress. [applause]

[Isakov] At this congress, unfortunately, Boris Nikolayevich is acting insincerely, and he is trying to avoid direct talk [angry calls from deputies] [words indistinct]—on the whole, everything for the sake of the main goal: presidential power that is not restricted by anything. [chairman calls out: "Time is up"; shouting in the hall]

[Khatayevich] I used the word maneuvering at the beginning of my report on the work of the congress today. Well, the afternoon sitting opened with rather lengthy attempts by one group or another to achieve some kind of advantage in the formation of the list of those speaking in the debates, by means of maneuvering. I will dwell on that because, as a result, everything was decided anyway, in accordance with the regulations and the traditions that have evolved. In a word, the debates were in vain, as was the time spent on them. Then there were questions for the speakers. Various questions were asked, possibly in connection with the position each of them holds in the Supreme Soviet of Russia. Zakharov, chairman of the Commission for Social Affairs, used his 20 minutes mainly to brief the deputies - of course, at their request—on the unresolved problems of pension and social provision. Isakov had to defend himself, and not without losses. Well, now, everyone chooses his own role in the political struggle.

As a result, the deputies' debates on the report of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet were able to begin only before the interval itself.

And the latest news. Taking into account the fact that the number of those who put their names forward to speak is truly astronomical—over 400, there has never been so many—it was decided to make Sunday 31 March a working day at the congress.

Goryacheva Address on 'Political Statement'

LD3103191791 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2255 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Speech by Svetlana Petrovna Goryacheva, deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Supreme Soviet, at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow on 30 March—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! Many deputies and deputies' groups have asked me to—and the situation, also makes me—ascend this rostrum and explain what has prompted me to speak out with a political statement. The most frightening part of what is taking place today is the merciless exploitation of the faith and patience of people, and a shameless divergence between words and deeds. I, too, trusted Boris Nikolayevich, his program, and supported his first steps in his capacity as head of the Russian legislature. But gradually, bewilderment began to build. The tasks being put forward are correct, the

slogans being proclaimed are correct, but there is no practical work. When I tried to speak about this they did not want to listen. Moreover, I felt resistance. What can be more important today than the stabilization of the economy? My conscience was upset when I became convinced of the inconsistency and unpredictability of the steps by Boris Nikolayevich on this issue precisely. Russia still has no program on how to come out of the crisis. Let us frankly admit this. another variant is being offered, but is it the final one?

On 4 January you, Boris Nikolayevich, together with the president, signed an agreement for 1991 for the stabilization of the social and economic situation in the country. This gave hope for the first steps in emerging from the crisis. This document contains the following point, and I quote: To implement a coordinated policy in the field of price setting, and to agree with the introduction of new wholesale and procurement prices and tariffs from 1 January 1991. It also dealt with the reform of retail prices. How then, following this, is it possible to assert that the issue of wholesale prices was resovled without the agreement of, and without coordination with, the Russian Federation? What happened thereafter? On 9 February the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet received proposals from the Cabinet of Ministers on the reform of retail prices, on raising them, and on the provision of payments in compensation. On 13 February members of the RSFSR Federation Council asked you almost unanimously to take this unpopular measure, Boris Nikolayevich, as price increases are nevertheless taking place spontaneously, and are getting out of control. It seemed that you had been convinced. The next day—14 February—this question was tabled for consideration by the Supreme Soviet, but on 15 February we discovered to our surprise at the session of the legislature—and that includes me, your deputy—that on 13 February you sent a letter to the Union government containing an ultimatum, saying that that kind of prices policy is unacceptable for us. [shouts of "correct" and murmuring in hall, with some applause] Similar unpredictable actions oblige one to think: What moves you, the desire for stabilization, or the desire to cause chaos? All civilized states do everything possible to get out of crisis. With steps of that kind we get deeper into it.

In the report yesterday, particular attention was devoted to the need to keep to the law, and that is indeed the general line for the renewal of Russia and the construction of a law-governed state. But what are you as chairman doing in actual fact? Knowing that issues of determining the structure of the staff and the estimate for the expenditure of the apparatus of the Supreme Soviet by law fall exclusively within the competence of the Supreme Soviet, you effectively decide them singlehandedly—and this, moreover, after the criticism that was voiced at the second extraordinary congress on this very question. Instead of the promised reduction in the expenditure on the apparatus of administration, what is taking place is a sharp increase in it. Judge for yourselves: Whereas there were 662 people working in the Supreme Soviet apparatus at the beginning of 1990, today there are 889 people in the establishment—a growth of nearly 40 percent. Expenditure has increased by 3 million rubles, and not to 27 million rubles, as you noted in your report, but almost to 60 million rubles. Why this is being done? For what purpose are decisions of that kind taken by a person whose high ratings rest to a large extent upon his former glory as an uncompromising campaigner against the growing bureaucratic structures and privileges in them?

Here are some examples from the activity of the presidium. The surprise tabling of issues that do not fall within its competence has become a practice. One of the most blatant examples here is the setting up of private commercial firms and banks with preferential taxation terms, including cases where foreign currency is concerned. The Russkiy Dom private company, the Russian-German society for the stimulation of enterprise, the association for economic and scientific and technical cooperation with Japan, and others function with the blessing of the Presidium. One can only guess why have we taken these particular firms under the care of the Presidium.

Let us recall that quite recently the legislature of Russia adopted a law, On Enterprise and Entrepreneural Activity, that allows for a different procedure for setting up commercial companies. Does this mean that we are ignoring both the Constitution and our own laws? What is the result? The activities of Russkiy Dom, headed by Ryashentsev, the former leader of ANT [foreign trade organization alleged last year to have been involved in illegal arms trading], which nearly brought about for Russia the loss of 300 billion rubles. The commission of deputies of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has confirmed the illegal character of the deal. The materials have been sent to the investigative bodies. It only remains to regret that Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, was involved in it, while the Presidium gave a green light to Russkiy Dom.

Is it not because it has become easy for us to make unlawful decisions at the Presidium that an emphasis has been placed in the report on the need to strengthen its role? Why do we then need a permanently sitting Supreme Soviet? A special place is given in the report to human rights, and to the processes of democratization. Much is being said about democracy in this hall, too. I have also had a taste of the democracy perpared according to the recipes of those who call themselves democrats. I have no right to keep silent on what happened to me after the well-known political declaration, and I would like to ask you, at least, to stop jeering now. The brand new Democratic Russia party showed its face. First, the representative of that bloc, RSFSR People's Deputy (Kopeyka), abusing his office as deputy chairman of the broadcasting committee of Maritime Kray, organized in my homeland, Maritime Kray, a broadcasting slander campaign against me. [commotion in hall] They say that he is being offered a job in the

Gosteleradio of Russia. Perhaps in payment for such services? The representatives of that bloc organized in a hurry, before my arrival in the kray, a meeting of the electorate, and set up an initiative group to recall me. [commotion in hall] The Presidium of Vladivostok Town Soviet, in violation of the law, promptly endorsed the group, and when the procurator of the kray made a formal protest—the legitimacy of which is now confirmed by the Russian Federation Procuracy—a slander campaign started against him as well.

I am not afraid of being recalled. But justice triumphed. The illegal decision was abolished. However, the passions did not subside. Envoys were sent from Moscow—both central and local media wrote about it—who unashamedly suggested that the electors get rid of Goryacheva as soon as possible.

I would like to ask you, who call yourselves democrats, how you want to deal with this—using moral right, or physical force? [shouts from floor] I was ready for such a turn of events. These methods and means have already been tried. But I cannot keep silent about what happened to my family: that did indeed shake me. My 70-year old mother-in-law could not stand the threats, and was admitted to the hospital. For nine months she courageously bore the burden of domestic life, creating conditions for me to work peacefully. But I cannot forgive the fact that even my 13-year old son was not spared. [speaker's voice breaks, more shouts and uproar from floor, bell, chairman shouts: "Gentlemen!"]

No, you just let me have my say! When I flew in to Vladivostok and met him, I did not recognize him. I was stunned by his eyes, which were full of pain and fear, the eyes of a hunted wild animal. Instead of a greeting, the first words he said to me were: Mommy! Thank goodness they have not killed you! You must not go out any more, and you must not go to Moscow, or they will kill you! They said they would deal with me, Bolshevik monster, too. So that is how we live now: I am here, fearful for the fate of my son, and he is in Vladivostok, worried about me. These events have perhaps robbed my son of his childhood forever.

But there turned out to be more good people. I am grateful to the teachers, friends, neighbors, and Afghan returnees, who found me and tried to protect and support me. Until 9 March, when you made your speech, Boris Nikolayevich, I was still under a delusion, thinking you were not involved in all this. But after you declared us to be enemies, and said you would fight even against women, I am convinced that you will not spare even children, either. [shouts from floor, bell rings again—Goryacheva shouts above uproar]

Now for the main reason I mounted this rostrum. I am convinced that many of those sitting here in the hall fought for a people 's deputy mandate in the sincere desire to resurrect tormented Russia, to bring it out of economic, social, and spiritual crisis. I, too, came here with the same intentions. By the will of destiny, I found myself working closely with Boris Nikolayevich. Together with the five deputies who signed the statement, I rapidly discovered that it is a struggle for power that is going on, of constructive work. I am convinced that many of you will sooner or later receive this insight. But if you become dissidents like me, you will have to be prepared for the moral terror that I and my family have been subjected to. What is this—democracy, or emergent fascism? [shouts from floor]

Dear women of Russia! In these days which have been so difficult for me, I have received a multitude of telegrams and letters of support from you. My great gratitude to you for this. It is my duty today to warn you of the possibility of a new and most fierce dictatorship of ambitious politicians, who will spare neither you nor your children. Rumors are being circulated that I have been spiritually crushed, and live like a repentent sinner. But I tell you, I made the political statement in full consciousness, and I do not regret it. I believe in the common sense of my people. If we are not understood today, the future will judge us. Thank you. [uproar, tumultuous applause]

Radio Highlights Yeltsin Criticism

LD3003210491 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Mar 91

["Excerpt" of speech by Svetlana Petrovna Goryacheva, deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Supreme Soviet, at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow on 30 March—recorded]

[Text] Many deputies and deputies' groups asked me to—and the situation also makes me—ascend this rostrum and explain what has prompted me to speak out with a political statement. The most frightening part of what is taking place today is the merciless exploitation of the faith and patience of people, and a shameless divergence between words and deeds. I, too, believed Boris Nikolayevich, has a program, and supported his first steps in his capacity as head of the Russian legislature. However, gradually, bewilderment started to build up. The tasks being put forward are correct, the slogans being proclaimed are correct, but there is no practical work. When I tried to speak about this they did not want to listen. Moreover, I felt resistance. What can be more important today than the stabilization of the economy? My conscience was upset when I became convinced of the inconsistency and unpredictability of the steps by Boris Nikolayevich on this issue precisely. Russia still has no program on how to come out of the crisis. Let us frankly admit this. Another variant is being offered, but is it the final one?

Prime Minister Silayev Presents Economic Program

LD3103174691 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2203 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Speech by Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Council of Ministers, at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow on 30 March—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Deputies: Since we have begun here to discuss that extremely important, indeed urgent, issue of the situation in the agrarian sector, I would like to devote a few minutes to this issue at the very start. I assure you that the law on the budget for 1991 adopted by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet maintains that 15 percent of national income should be allocated to the development of the countryside. If anyone has any doubts about it, they may come to the Finance Ministry, or I can ask the finance minister and he will show you the figures. I suppose Comrade Lapshin can easily see them. But the point is different. The trouble is that rapidly increasing prices for agricultural equipment and materials, as well as on fuel, and so forth, have in practice reduced the effectiveness of that 15 percent. If we had stayed at the 4-percent level as it was before, you can imagine what would happen today.

What measures are we taking in this situation? First, we are introducing price indexation, according to the decisions of the second Congress of People's Deputies—prices for agricultural products, industrial commodities, services, and so forth. According to the results of the first half of the year, we will make adjustments so that the agricultural sector receives everything it is entitled to according to the indexation. As a compensation for the growing prices of construction works, we are allocating 5.7 billion rubles [R]. Blue- and white-collar workers, collective farmers, enterprises, and organizations will receive payments from budget sources in connection with rising prices within the agro-industrial complex, as well as retail price rises for food and other goods beginning 2 April. For these needs, R5.5 billion are being allocated. Thus, we are strictly adhering and will continue to adhere to the decisions made by the second Congress of People's Deputies.

Now to the main issue, which compelled me to ask for permission to speak: the issues in the sphere of the economic reform. The program is outlined in considerable detail in the materials that have been given to you. Therefore, I will concentrate on the most important principles of the economic policy, in order to develop points of the economic section of the report made by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. The basis of our approach is formed by the thesis that the reason for a steady worsening of the situation in the country and in the republic does not lie in the disruption of the economic links, nor in the decline of discipline, nor in the loss of control. These are not the reasons, but the results.

The reason lies in the fact that for several years we have been counting on a smooth transition from the old planned-administrative system of economic management to a market system. Now we are reaping the bitter fruits of those expectations. To bank on a gradual transformation has proved to be unjustified. The time when the changes would have been a hundred times easier and less painful has been missed. Why? Because we have spent an unforgivably long time hanging on to our socialist virginity and seeing in every real step toward the market an indecent reversion to practices which have become standard throughout the world, from Shanghai to New York. [applause]

The only way out of this situation is a decisive switch to market relations. The government is of the view that methods which have proved their worth throughout the world absolutely must be developed here in our country, too. Briefly, the plan of action is as follows.

First, to increase the output of goods in all spheres, primarily those for the consumer market, economically beneficial conditions must be created in which enterprises, establishments, and entrepreneurs can operate actively. To this end, the government proposes to make the output development funds tax exempt and to reduce taxation on enterprises' profits to no more than 30 percent. In addition, foreign currency should remain with those who have earned it, those who have produced and supplied goods for export. [applause]

We think that only that part of profits remaining after deduction of foreign currency costs should be taxable. I stress, we have no intention of continuing to put up with a situation in which all foreign currency goes to the center. The government regards it as its duty to ensure true economic freedom. Producers of goods should themselves enjoy the benefits of their output. This offers a way for enterprises to escape the authority of administrative structures, and here I have in mind not only those at the Union level but also those within our republic. We do not aim to entice them from one structure to another, to switch them from one form of subordination to another. We are for any enterprises and organizations and all producers being accorded economic independence. [applause]

In that case, economic relations among enterprises from any geographical area should again follow the classical form, which is to say that they should display respect for local taxes and laws and budget payments. But it must be emphasized that we are against the dispersion of large-scale capital which has been concentrated under the umbrella of Union ministries and departments. This is dangerous, when viewed in the light of the essential need to make them able to operate in the world economy. Major economic complexes which are prepared to forego budget financing of their production programs and switch to seeking commercial credit will be able to count on moral and material support from us. We shall offer them government guarantees for credits on preferential terms, foreign investment, and grant licenses for mineral exploitation and give other kinds of help.

Second, it is necessary to lift all organizational barriers; and we are planning to do this in the way of those who would like to start their own business, to set up a new enterprise, which means new jobs. For this pu~pose, we are simplifying the registration procedure for new enterprises and reducing the amount of bookkeeping reports. Only those documents necessary for a timely and precise filing of tax returns will remain.

Third, the business energy of our citizens is low because they lack incentives. The chief barrier is the lack of money and the lack of incentive to invest it in business. In order to make the citizens want to earn spare cash and enable them to do so, we are suggesting that the income tax rates should be sharply reduced. In the rest of the world these rates do not exceed 30 percent. [applause]

Someone could say that this will play into the hands of the shadow economy. Let me disagree with this. Crooks and thieves have always found and will always find a way to deceive the state and conceal their real incomes. But why are honest citizens of Russia, who form the overwhelming majority, not allowed to earn by their labor as much as they are capable of earning? Why, while worrying about the profits of the shadow economy, do we regard calmly the lines in front of Western embassies? The government thinks a sharp reduction of income taxes would help to prevent a disastrous brain drain, with the best specialists and business people going abroad. Moreover, under the conditions of inevitable inflation, this measure must also be regarded as a means of social protection of the population.

These are the three key points. All the other issues, in one way or another, revolve around them. World experience shows that you cannot raise prices in order to make an enterprise or an entrepreneur interested in increasing the output of goods. The prices must be freed. We are planning to do this according to a definite procedure, stage by stage, by first freeing the prices on groups of goods whose production can be rapidly increased. The method of the so-called balanced basket [metod sbalansirovannoy korziny] will allow us to conduct these operations so that the price hikes on some of these goods will not lead to sharp fluctuations of the purchasing power of the population.

We think it is possible, within six to eight months, to free and completely stabilize prices for the main groups of commodities. Further, we are intending to protect our ruble from the inflationary pressure of unjustified state expenditure and, already this year, to stop such an economic nonsense as budget financing of the national economy. Spare budget resources will be turned into credit resources.

Cheap credit means cheap money. It is also well known that our economy is suffering from a catastrophic shortage of capital. Attracting and encouraging foreign investment, as well as integration with the world market, is becoming for Russia an issue of primary significance. Without this, you cannot hope to achieve a world level of technology or a world level of living standards. The decisive condition here is convertibility of the ruble. Full convertibility is still beyond the powers of Russian authorities, but partial convertibility will for enterprises and citizens open up access to the world market. Therefore we intend to lift without delay all restrictions on buying and selling hard currency for all enterprises and citizens on the territory of the republic. [applause] We ask the RSFSR Supreme Soviet to make the appropriate amendments in the criminal legislation.

I remind you that Article 88 of our Russian criminal code envisages from three years imprisonment to death as punishment for violating laws that no Russian lawmakers have established. Sovereignty in foreign currency matters is an inalienable part of Russian sovereignty and must not be given up. [applause]

Furthermore, we think that the great chaos which today reigns in material-technical supply is a direct result of the mass centralized appropriation of food, which is today called state order [goszakaz]. The year 1991 will be the last year of this appropriation of food in Russia. All resources should enter onto the market and be distributed with the aid of the market mechanism, the exchange, trade houses, intermediary supply firms, and so on. They are already finding their feet; and with our help, by the end of this year they will be able to assume responsibility for most of the turnover of goods. The state order should really be a state order to fulfill state needs and to support the budget structures of Russia's economy. [applause]

We talk a lot about the fact that our production is not competitive. We correctly question... [changes thought] You correctly ask questions about when machine-builders will provide for the most important spheres in our production, particularly for the countryside, the necessary construction materials and other types of machine-building production at the highest level and in the necessary quantities. This is the most important task today.

In order to make progress on this issue, it is essential...we think it is most essential to open up our internal economic market and our trade fairs for foreign entrepeneurs who can bring in the goods which are essential for the countryside and the town. Along with this, there will be a reliable system to protect our native industry from being stifled by powerful importers. We are not afraid of this. We think our consumer market is ready so that in two or three years we can have native and imported products available on our market, without them hindering each other. We can then move on to introduce the necessary quotas.

Some questions demand to be resolved and to have the support of, among others, the Congress of People's Deputies. The most important issue is the division of ownership. In any program, including the one which you now have in your hands, this issue is most pertinent. We have proclaimed independence for those organizations

which are leaving the ministerial structures in order to begin functioning freely. However, here we have seen practically no results to date. We have put forward proposals according to which those collectives and enterprises which wanted to could come under Russian jurisdiction; however, certain relevant documents have been issued within the Union structures which have forbidden us to do this. We therefore ask for support so that we can implement your decisions about state sovereignty in reality and can issue instructions regarding the activities of enterprises which lie on our territory.

Of course, a most important question is that of emissions of money and financial policy as whole, the price formation policy, foreign economic activity, and customs policy. These issues are, naturally, not isolated. It is not possible to resolve them separately in any republic taken separately, even one such as Russia. That is why we are prepared to work persistently, including with the Cabinet of Ministers, to try to gain the rights to the greater part of our export potential and natural resources, and the rights to conduct the corresponding customs policy in the interests of Russia.

With the aim of protecting the resources of our enterprises from the influence of central bodies, such as the bank for foreign economic activity, Vneshekonombank, we are considering a legislative ban on the republic's territory on confiscation and freezing of monies of enterprises and citizens, unless with the permission of the court, and permitting Russian enterprises to open foreign currency accounts in commercial banks, including foreign ones, as deterined by the RSFSR Council of Ministers. Today our RSFSR Vneshekonombank does not have a single tonne or a single kilogram of gold in order to be respected by banks abroad.

The third thing is to stimulate the formation of modern systems of accounting independently of the USSR Gosbank [State Bank].

The relationship with regions is a very important question. We can see that the main events, including the resolution of many social issues, are tackled locally, in settlements and in the towns and republics of the Russian Federation. That is why we propose a radical change in the forming of the budget and the division of functions starting in 1992, in the same emergency budget that was mentioned in Boris Nikolayevich's report. We think it is necessary to hand over a considerable part of state property to municipal and republican (?control), apart from federal. We are passing rental payments to them. That is very important for normal development, especially in raw materials regions, and is an agreed proportion of per-tree payments for use of forestry. We think it is sensible to leave as much as 40-50 percent of tax income at the disposal of local authorities, where some enterprise or another is operating. By this token we plan to tie up the interests of those working at an enterprise and the interests of local authority bodies, and their need for each other. [applause]

I do not have the opportunity to speak in detail about privatization, particularly small-scale privatization; but I would like to stress the need, and our support and resolve for the implementation this year, before autumn, in time for autumn harvest work, of privatization of all the small enterprises and establishments, up to and including agricultural foods shops, which work on storing, processing, and marketing farm produce for the population. We think this will be the beginning of the end of the processes of annual emergency calls on everyone from the Army to the academics to harvest potatoes, cut cabbage, and carry and sort all this rotten stuff to public sector warehouses and shops that are of no interest to anyone.

If we do not do this, then within at least a year we shall be reliving the nightmare which is repeated annually, year after year, despite all the incantations and administrative directives.

Now, a few words about the market and the military-industrial complex. We are proposing for the defense industries, even if they remain within the Union ministries, a program of cooperation in the sphere of research, development, and production of consumer goods in conditions of market relations. We shall establish a favorable method of taxation on profits of a given category of enterprises in the section, which is obtained from the output of civil production. We think it is more efficient to involve enterprises of the military-industrial complex in the solving of socioeconomic programs of the territories. We also think it is necessary to strive for a separation of plants of the military industries in those areas where it is possible to do so for civil and defense production. If this separation is possible, then we shall do all we can to assist it.

Finally—excuse me, I am winding up—our program also provides for a role and place for scientific-technical progress in market conditions. I have dwelt on this, Comrades, because I want to draw your attention to the fact that we have a specific action program. It has been set out in these programs. I ask you to support our proposals so that they can really become approved programs. We are ready to execute it.

Just a couple of words about our attitude, the government's attitude, toward the miners: Yesterday, the Presidium of the RSFSR Council of Ministers examined a question connected with an appeal by a number of collectives of mines in Vorkuta and the Kuznetsk Basin that they be accepted into the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation. The movement is wider than specific enterprises. As far as I know, yesterday the corresponding collectives that represent our coal basins proposed an appeal to our congress as a whole, and it would probably be advisable to hear this appeal. We have adopted a decision to begin preparations for the possibility of accepting mines, irrespective of their economic condition, into the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation. [applause]

We understand that the Council of Ministers is taking a big burden upon itself, but we, as citizens of Russia, cannot allow ourselves to leave the miners in such a disastrous state without taking their economic, social, and working needs into consideration. They are our citizens, and we are obliged to be concerned about them. [applause]

Esteemed Comrade People's Deputies, we have presented this program. We are ready to take it up and to fight for it. We believe that if minimal support is expressed in a way that strengthens executive power—subordination vertically is extremely necessary to us in tackling a number of acts of legislation and in the tackling by the congress of two questions: support for our actions in the finance and customs fields—we say that this should belong to the Russian Federation next year, and by support for our actions to offer an opportunity to any enterprise, large and small, to come under the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation. In this instance, with these minimum conditions, we are confident that we shall cope with our task. Thank you for your attention. [applause]

TASS Highlights Address

LD3003161691 Moscow TASS in English 1603 GMT 30 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lev Aksyonov]

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—A resolute transition to market- based relations is the only thing capable of helping Russia overcome the extremely grave crisis, Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev said today at the third extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of Russia. He set forth the economic programme of the government headed by him.

Silayev beleives that "the time when changes could have been a hundred times less painful has been missed. We took too long to preserve our socialist virginity, regarding every practical step towards the market as the indecent retreat to the practices that have been firmly established throughout the world—from Shanghai to New York."

Setting forth his government's economic programme, Silayev stressed that its core was the creation of beneficial conditions for economic activities to enterprises and entrepreneurs. Specifically, with this in view it is planned to reduce profits tax to the level of 30 per cent. At the same time, the prime minister believes that "it is necessary to remove obstacles on the way of those who wish to start their own business" by reducing the level of income tax. According to Silayev, enterprises should be given economic independence and be set free from the authority of government structures, "both union and Russian ones."

Foreign economic relations feature prominently in the programme of the Russian Government. In this connection he pointed to the importance of opening Russia's domestic market for foreign businessmen. He stressed that it should be allowed to buy and sell freely foreign currency on republican territory, and an opportunity should be given to Russian enterprises to open currency accounts in foreign banks.

The Russian prime minister also set forth elements of the government programme dealing with the role of enterprises of the military-industrial complex in the production of consumer goods and the place of scientific and technological progress in the implementation of market-oriented reforms.

Concluding his report, Silayev added that the Russian Government had decided recently to begin preparations for "admitting coal mines of the Vorkuta and Kuznetsk coal fields to the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation, irrespective of their economic situation."

Shakray Says Yeltsin Ouster Unrealistic

LD3003211291 Moscow TASS in English 2054 GMT 30 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lev Aksyonov]

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—With the present alignment of forces among Russian legislators it is unrealistic to ensure "simple or qualified majority" of votes for ousting chairman of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin, Sergey Shakhray, chairman of the parliamentary Committee for Legislation and member of the Presidium of the Republican parliament, said at a press conference today. It was held at the press centre of the third extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation.

He described the decision of the congress, which did not include in the agenda the item about executive presidency in Russia, as a "constitutional pretext for dissolving the congress."

Shakhray believes that by adopting this resolution the legislators ignored the will of the electors, most of whom voted at the March 17 referendum for the introduction of executive presidency in Russia. He expressed hope that the current congress would return in this or that form to discussing the problem of executive presidency. Shakhray said that 260 Russian legislators had signed a demand on the convocation of an extraordinary congress, which would tackle the problem of executive presidency in Russia.

He devoted much attention to the analysis of the report made on Friday by Boris Yeltsin. According to Shakhray, one of the conclusions that could be drawn from his report is "the recognition of the impossibility of communism, as well as the impossibility of the return to pure capitalism." He said that the only possible way was the creation of "post-socialist society."

Western Republics

Ukraine Miners' Strike 'Remains Critical'

LD3003220691 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Text] The situation in the coal regions of the Ukraine remains critical. The number of pits on strike in Donbass and Lvov-Volhynia Basin was 47 by this evening. This information was given to me by Stanislav Yanko, one of the leaders of the republican committee for the coal industry. He also informed that in recent days polarization in their attitudes to the strike is increasing among miners. A number of pits have already resumed work, but at the same time several work collectives have quite to the contrary stopped it.

Stanislav Yanko also noted that representatives of the Union and republican governments, who examine possibilities for the industry to come out of crisis, are working in the miners' regions at present. However, as Stanislav Yanko stressed, the presence in the Donbass of emissaries of the U.S. Miners' Professional Center, who support the continuation of the strike and promise financial aid to its participants, does not foster stabilization of the situation.

Kravchuk Discusses Union Treaty, Gorbachev

LD2903190691 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 28 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent Mykola Marynenko on news conference with Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Chairman Leonid Kravchuk in Kiev on 28 March—Kravchuk remarks recorded]

[Excerpts] [Marynenko] Speaking at the meeting with Ukrainian and foreign journalists, Kravchuk, the chairman of the Republican Supreme Soviet, in particular stresses the pecularities of the last plebiscite's results in Ukraine.

[Kravchuk] The Ukraine is peculiar in the sense that the people of Ukraine expressed itself not only for the Union but it expressed itself for the union of certain nature and certain content—the union of sovereign states on the basis of the declaration of state sovereignty. More than 80 percent of electors who took part in the voting voted for this. This is an important political moement, extremely important, because we now have a task to build a new Union treaty and the Supreme soviet has already started doing it. We think that it should be a new union built on new principles, that the Ukraine must have full rights in this union—full rights—no more, but no less either. [passage omitted]

[Marynenko] Proceeding from the legislature's resolution, which says that the Ukraine will not sign the new Union treaty until the new constitution of the Republic is adopted, we, correspondents, were interested to know when this new basic law will be adopted. Here is Leonid Kravchuk's answer:

[Kravchuk] Tomorrow, we will hold a session of the Constitutional Commission here. It will be the last session. After that, the concept of the new constitution will be submitted to the Supreme Soviet. We do not want to precisely have a constitution which is adjusted to some leader, but we would want it to be adjusted to the will of the Ukrainian people, to its history and, what is most important, this must be a constitution of the state with full rights. It will look exactly like that to the world. [passage omitted]

[Maryenko] A question from one of my colleagues was as follows: Can Leonid Kravchuk imagine tanks on Khreshchatyk Street tomorrow? Kravchuk answered confidently that he directed all his actions at preventing such development of events. Leonid Kravchuk believes it is for this purpose that the sovereignty of the Ukraine, which has been declared, has to be supported and strengthened not by words but by concrete deeds. The republic will hold out because it has the basis necessary to do so.

Here is another question: Is there a problem in the relationship between Leonid Kravchuk and President Mikhail Gorbachev? The Supreme Soviet Chairman gave the following answer:

[Kravchuk] We treat each other with respect. We listen to each other, i.e. it is normal relationship between political leaders. All the rest of it, well, Mikhail Sergeyevich has got his own point of view. He is a supporter of a, let us say, renewed federation, which is known to everyone. I am a supporter of a union of sovereign states, and this is known to everyone as well. I will stand my ground. I am convinced that he will stand his ground, but the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine will make a final decision on this issue. We will have a document with which plenipotentiary representatives of the Supreme Soviet of ithe Ukraine will be delegated to uphold the document to the letter, as they say.

[Maryenko] Leonid Kravchuk, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, also answered a number of other questions asked by Ukrainian and foreign journalists at the news conference today in Kiev.

Caucasus

Reportage on Georgian 31 Mar Poll, Referendum

Communists Demand Equal Rights

AU2803162791 Tbilisi VESTNIK GRUZII in Russian 22 Mar 91 p 2

[Declaration by the Central Committee of the Georgian Independent Comminust Party; place and date not given]

[Text] A decision **on the party's participation in the elections of the republican local organs of government** was adopted at the plenum of the Central Committee of the Georgian Independent Communist Party. Thus, it has once again confirmed its adherence to the policy being pursued by the republic's Supreme Soviet in resolving tasks that concern vitally important interests of Georgia.

The position of the Georgian communist party with regard to the sociopolitical and socioeconomic problems that the republic is facing during the transitional period has been expressed in the preelection program published in the course of the Georgian Supreme Soviet election campaign.

The Communist Party of Georgia, which is independent, renewed, and firmly adhering to national positions, again publicly declares that it sees the sole purpose of its existence in serving the interests of Georgia. The party will do everything to promote the intensification of democratic processes, the establishment of social and national justice, a radical perestroyka of economic life, the strengthening of the law and law enforcement, and the moral and cultural renaissance of our people.

The Communist Party of Georgia is striving to consolidate healthy national forces and is open to constructive and equal cooperation and dialogue with all political parties and movements and to a comprehensive discussion of various opinions. It is deeply convinced that general consolidation alone will promote a sensible and logical solution to the vitally important problems that are now facing our republic.

The election campaign opens up a wide road for **different opinions on how to settle our independent state life and how to build relationships with one another, with neighboring peoples, and with other states.**

The communist party believes that, in this situation, it is absolutely unacceptable to erect artificial barriers to any of the parties or movements participating in the elections, limit their electoral rights, or discredit them by groundless declarations, unlawful actions, or other unconstitutional and uncivilized methods. Unfortunately, such unlawful actions with regard to the communist party are still plentiful. At the same time, the law enforcement organs do not virtually undertake any actions to put an end to such phenomena and do not call those responsible for them to account.

All this has an unfavorable effect upon the course of the election campaign. In many regions, party organizations were forced to give up their participation in the elections. That is why **it is necessary to take urgent measures to ensure electoral rights of every party, movement, or individual and to prevent any unconstitutional actions against them.**

We must all be united by a common goal—the election to local organs of power of decent persons, those who are trusted by our people and in whose wisdom and reason it believes.

It is not party affiliation or social status of one candidate or another that must be regarded as the main criterion in the elections but his civic position and his ability to contribute to Georgia's prosperity.

Political struggle must be based on relations that are highly ethical, honest, and are characterized by mutual respect.

The Central Committee of the Georgian Independent Communist Party.

Elections, Independence Vote Begin

LD3103065191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0500 GMT 31 Mar 91

[Text] Local elections are taking place in Georgia today. Our correspondent Nana Gongadze reports from Tbilisi.

[Gongadze] All 3,000 polling stations opened this morning at 0700. The republic's population have to not only named those candidates who will take up places in the new local authorities, the so-called (sakribula) assembly, but also to answer a single question: Do you agree that the state independence of Georgia should be restored on the basis of the Act of Independence of 26 May 1918?

Deputies' mandates will be distributed today among the candidates of around thirty Georgian political parties and organizations. Taking into account the multinational composition of the electorate, the voting papers have been printed in seven languages—Georgian, Abkhazian, Russian, Ossetian, Azerbaijani, Armenian, and Greek. This time not only the names of the candidates have been printed, but also facts about them. For in every constituency several names are to be chosen. For this reason the voter, by placing No. 1, indicates his preference for one individual. With the number 2, the voter indicates the candidate acceptable after the first one, and so on. So everyone has the possibility to make his own personal, free choice.

On the eve of the referendum well-known sovietologists, scholars, and specialists came to Tbilisi. Representatives of 15 of the world's countries are here in the role of observers. Of course, the result of today's poll will be of great significance, since the democratic will of the people must play the determining role in their future.

Referendum, Elections Viewed

LD3103102291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0853 GMT 31 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Igor Gvritishvili]

[Text] Tbilisi, 31 Mar (TASS)—A referendum on the restoration of state independence for Georgia is taking place throughout that Transcaucasian republic today.

Almost 3.5 million voters, 30 percent of whom are of non-Georgian nationality, are to answer the question:

"Do you agree to the restoration of Georgia's state independence on the basis of the act of independence of 26 May 1918?"

The referendum is taking place amid a complex internal political situation. As is known, the leadership of the republic boycotted the 17 March all-Union referendum. Despite this decision, the population of Abkhazia, an autonomous republic that is part of Georgia, and South Ossetia, stripped of its autonomy by the Georgian legislature, took part in the voting and came out in favor of the preservation of the Union.

The central electoral commission told a TASS correspondent that it is unlikely that the Ossetian population of South Ossetia, as well as the majority of Abkhazians, will take part in the republican referendum, although ballots have been printed in the languages of these ethnic groups and have been sent to the areas.

According to the Georgian election law, servicemen who are not under the jurisdiction of the state authority of the republic, and also persons of Georgian nationality who are not registered in the republic, do not have the right to take part in the referendum.

The leaders of Georgia attach enormous significance to the voting today. Their addresses on television and in the newspapers the previous day came down to the future of the republic depending on the results of the referendum.

Representatives of the United States, the FRG, Belgium, Great Britain, and Japan have been invited to observe the referendum. Representatives of the Baltic republics, Moldova, the Ukraine, and some cities of Russia have also arrived.

Elections to local bodies are also taking place in Georgia today. Twenty-eight parties and party blocs are taking part in them. The voters are to elect 21,000 deputies to municipal assemblies. Although the authority of these assemblies will be rather limited due to the introduction of the institute of prefects appointed by the Georgian Supreme Soviet, these elections will have great significance in the sense that they will show how far the alignment of political forces that arose after last year's general elections, when the Round Table-Free Georgian Party won an absolute victory, has been preserved.

80 Percent Vote in Referendum

LD0104084891 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] Reports have come in about the high activity of the population at Sunday's referendum in Georgia on restoring independence. Preliminary returns show that about 80 percent of the population took part. Low activity was in Abkhaziya which is seeking independence from Georgia. There was no plebiscite in the capital of South Ossetia, Tskhinvali, where fierce armed clashes are going on between the Ossetians and Georgians. The referendum returns are expected shortly.

INTERFAX Cited on Vote

AU0104092991 Paris AFP in English 0917 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, April 1 (AFP)—Georgians voted massively for independence from the Soviet Union in a referendum on Sunday [31 March], according to early unofficial results reported by the news agency INTERFAX on Monday.

The agency reported that the turnout had been above 80 per cent among the republic's 3.4 million voters, and that 90 per cent had answered "yes" to the question "Do you favor the reestablishment of Georgia's independence on the basis of the Georgian democratic republic created on May 26, 1918?"

The nationalist Georgian government has said that it intends to use the result of the polls as a "legal document" in independence negotiations with Moscow.

Tbilisi Airport Closed for 'Technical Reasons'

LD3003221191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 2130 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] Tbilisi Airport will be closed from 3 to 20 April for technical reasons. The four services to Moscow and one each to Leningrad and Tashkent will start from the military airport not far from the Georgian capital.

Gorbachev Cables Gamsakhurdia To Stop Bloodshed

LD3003165991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1610 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar (TASS)—"The USSR Supreme Soviet and the country's president are receivig many appeals that express great concern over the sharp exacerbation of the situation in the town of Tskhinvali and in the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast in general. This is stated in a telegram from USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev sent today to Zviad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Georgian Republic Supreme Soviet. Fighting men are rampaging, the blood of Ossetian and Georgian citizens is being shed, dozens of villages have been burned down, civilians are being forced to leave their places of residence, and thousands of refugees are suffering hardships. Once again confirming the decisions of the country's supreme bodies of power, I propose that measures are taken without delay to stop bloodshed, to put an end to the actions of fighting men, to suppress their plans to seize and destroy settlements, and to start negotiations."

South Ossetians Appeal to Leadership for Help

LD2903130191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1200 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Text] The situation in South Ossetia remains extremely tense. Almost all Ossetian villages have been destroyed

or burned down by bands of Georgian fighters. There have been victims among the civilian population. At numerous meetings the citizens of Tskhinvali and refugees have adopted an appeal to the country's leadership that help be given immediately.

South Ossetians Flee 'Burned, Pillaged' Homes

LD2903232691 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The situation in South Ossetia remains complex. Tskhinvali is being fired upon day and night from State Motor Vehicle Inspection Directorate posts where the territory is controlled by Georgian militia.

As before, a concentration of the forces of illegal armed Georgian formations, which number up to 12,000 people, is to be observed around the oblast center.

Practically all Ossetian villages in South Ossetia have been burned and pillaged. In the past 24 hours alone, over 3,000 people have arrived in Tskhinvali from ravaged Ossetian villages. There are practically no foodstuffs or medicines in the town. Electricity, gas, and water supplies are intermittent.

There was a procession of women and children in Tskhinvali, which ended in a rally. At it, the demand for the introduction of a state of emergency on the entire territory of South Ossetia was put forward.

Situation in South Ossetia 'Remains Serious'

LD3003093291 Moscow TASS in English 0855 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—The situation in South Ossetia remains serious. A spokesman for the Soviet Interior Ministry told TASS that intensive skirmishes broke out between Georgian and Ossetian armed groups in the environs of Tskhinvali on the night of March 27. A Soviet Interior Ministry check point in the city was fired at from automatic weapons.

About 400 people were taken away from villages in the Tskhinvali district under the guard of Soviet Interior Ministry troops. All in all, more than 1,300 people were evacuated in recent days.

TASS reported from Vladikavkaz, North Ossetia, that according to the North Ossetian Interior Ministry, Tskhinvali comes under fire from the side of road traffic control posts, where the territory is controlled by the Georgian police, day and night.

Several houses were burnt in the city on Friday. Picketers from unlawful armed groups of Georgians, whose number reaches 12,000, continue to be concentrated around the city. Virtually all Ossetian villages in South Ossetia were burnt and looted. In the remaining villages in the Tskhinvali and Znauri districts residents offer resistence to actions by armed groups. Civilian casualties are reported.

There are virtualy no food and medicines in Tskhinvali. The supply of electricity, gas and water is erratic. All roads leading to the city are blocked.

Tskhinvali Residents Call for State of Emergency

LD3003164791 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 30 Mar 91

[Report by TASS correspondent from Vladikavkaz, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] According to information from the Ministry of Internal Affairs of North Ossetia, which reached the press center of the extraordinary committee of the North Ossetian Supreme Soviet chairman today, the situation in South Ossetia has reached the critical point. Last night intensive shooting was heard in Tskhinvali and surrounding areas. Tskhinvali is completely surrounded by over 12,000 armed guerrillas who have military equipment at their disposal. Additional armed guerrilla forces are closing in on the town. Some of them are moving along the Znaurskiy highway. It is believed here that they have probably decided to seize all Ossetian villages and then launch a massive attack on Tskhinvali and Dzhavskiy rayon, which are still controlled by the Ossetian side. There is a catastrophic shortage of food and medicine in Tskhinvali.

Humanitarian assistance is not reaching the blockaded town, since all the roads are held by the other side involved in the confrontation. Residential districts in the town are under constant fire from Georgian outposts. There are over 200 seriously injured people in the oblast hospital at the moment. In view of the developing situation, it is essential to evacuate them urgently to Vladikavkaz.

Very grim days are in store for villages in Tskhinvali rayon and individual settlements in Znaurskiy rayon which have not yet been completely burnt down and destroyed. The village of Dmanisi, for example, is surrounded by over 2,500 guerrillas. It is defended by only 250 men. Detachments of USSR Interior Ministry troops have evacuated over 3,000 people—mostly women and children—from Ossetian villages to Tskhinvali during the last 24 hours. The influx of Ossetian refugees to both Tskhinvali and North Ossetia is increasing. Up to 1,000 people of Ossetian nationality are being driven out of various districts of Georgia every day.

The population of besieged Tskhinvali and the refugees who have arrived there from destroyed villages have made an urgent appeal to the country's leadership for immediate assistance and the imposition of a state of emergency throughout South Ossetia. They are convinced that USSR Interior Ministry troops can prevent the genocide of the Ossetian people.